
GOD vs. DARWIN
The Logical Supremacy of Intelligent Design Creationism over Evolution
M. S. King

GOD vs DARWIN

The Logical Supremacy of Intelligent Design
Creationism over Evolution

By M S King © 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1: There Are Only Three Choices

CHAPTER 2: What Do Atheistic Evolutionists Actually Believe

CHAPTER 3: Logical Fallacies, Cognitive Biases & Rhetorical Tricks

CHAPTER 4: The Magic Church of Theoretical Science

CHAPTER 5: The Big Bang & the Big Blend

CHAPTER 6: Stalin's Primordial Soviet Soup

CHAPTER 7: Darwin's Theory of Marilyn & the Maggot

CHAPTER 8: Darwin Destroys Evolution with His Own Words

CHAPTER 9: Haeckel's Hideous Hoax

CHAPTER 10: The Evolution of Evolution

CHAPTER 11: The Fallacy of the "Simple" Single-Cell Organism

CHAPTER 12: The Fallacy of the "Super Rat"

CHAPTER 13: The Fallacy of the 98% Chimp-Human DNA Match

CHAPTER 14: DNA (Darwin Nailed Again!)

CHAPTER 15: Darwinian Evolution Fails the Scientific Method

CHAPTER 16: The Folly of Theistic Evolution

CHAPTER 17: Karl Loves Chuckie

CHAPTER 18: The Intelligent Idiot

CHAPTER 19: The Paradox of Intolerant Tolerance

CHAPTER 20: The Flow Chart of Fraud

CHAPTER 21: The Positive Case for Intelligent Design

CHAPTER 22: Geniuses Who Believe in God

CHAPTER 23: Face to Face With the Big G

CHAPTER 24: Nice Guys Finish Last

FOOTNOTES

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

M. S. King is a private investigative journalist and researcher based in the New York City area. A 1987 Graduate of Rutgers University, King's subsequent 30 year career in Marketing & Advertising has equipped him with a unique perspective when it comes to understanding how "public opinion" is indeed scientifically manufactured.

Madison Ave marketing acumen combines with 'City Boy' instincts to make Michael S. King one of the most tenacious detectors of "things that don't add up" in the world today. Says King of his admitted quirks, irreverent disdain for 'conventional wisdom' and uncanny ability to ferret out and weave together important data points that others miss: "*Had Sherlock Holmes been an actual historical personage, I would have been his reincarnation."*

In ***God vs. Darwin***, King utilizes the basic rules of Socratic reason and logic to inquisitively press upon the multiple weak spots and classic logical fallacies which keep Unscientific Atheism standing.

King's other interests include the animal kingdom, philosophy, chess, cooking literature, history, *(with emphasis on events of the late 19th through the 20th century)*.

INTRODUCTION

Your humble author's very first foray into the vast realm of theology / philosophy occurred at the wise old age of 6, during 1st grade religion class at St. Josephs Elementary School in Newark, NJ. Sister Carmela was recounting the Old Testament story about a defiant Jonah being swallowed by a whale, which was acting under God's orders. After 3 days of praying, the repentant Jonah was finally vomited out by the great fish *(mammal actually)*.

Not understanding the mechanism which blocks the ocean from flooding into the beast's massive stomach, your precocious little author-to-be had the inadvertent impertinence to ask, *"Sister. Wouldn't Jonah have drowned to death when he was inside the whale's stomach?"*

Evidently, Sister Carmela *(God rest her soul)* knew as little about Marine Biology as I did. Nonetheless, a simple *"With God, all things are possible"* would have satisfied my respectful curiosity. Instead, Sister mocked me simply for asking a plausible question, *"Michael the showoff here thinks he knows more than God!"* Following her lead, Sister Carmela's captive groupies joined in her laughter, at my expense.

For a 6 year old child this was a memorable, perhaps even mildly traumatic life event. Though I could not define the logical fallacies at play at the time, I instinctively sensed, and loathed, the dangerous dynamic of what I now refer to as AGR *(Authority – Groupthink – Ridicule)*. Whatever the Authority says must not be questioned, the Group obediently conforms, and the free thinker is ridiculed - perhaps even hated. For teaching me that life lesson at such an early age, albeit accidentally, Sister Carmela ranks as among the greatest teachers that I ever had.

Now the event did not shake my faith and I proceeded through Elementary and High School as a "Cafeteria Catholic"; dropping by Church on holidays, and earnestly praying whenever I got into trouble *(which was often)* or wanted something *(also often)*. Then came University.

Although a Marketing Major, I was still compelled to take a few basic courses in various scientific disciplines. The Science professors were all Atheistic Big Banger-Evolutionists with "Phd" after their name. The various Political Science Professors all held the same view as well. These "intellectual giants" wouldn't be teaching at the University level if they didn't know what they were talking about, or so I reasoned.

By the close of freshman year I was an Agnostic; and by the end of sophomore year, an Atheist. Though never one to blindly worship authority, I was intellectually lazy in this regard. Science had spoken and decreed that there is no Intelligent Designer. Who was I as a "B" student party boy to question it? Now free of any higher obligations, I could, without reservation, indulge in the debauchery that is modern college life.

During senior year, there came an incident that would rattle my 2 year old faith in the religion of Atheism. No, it wasn't a near death experience or a personal trauma. It was something far more subtle, and it happened during a course on Astronomy.

Professor Melski was a cleaned up hippie straight out of the Woodstock Era; smart as heck and very engrossing in his presentation. At the end of each class *(which met twice weekly)* the unconventional Melski would issue a brief "take home Quiz". These mini assignments were voluntary,

anonymous, and not graded. At the end of these Quizzes, there always appeared a comment section in which the anonymous student was free to submit to the quirky Professor any question he wanted about any topic; science, politics, sports, pop culture etc.

At the beginning of each class, Melski would address two or three of the questions which he found most interesting. It was his forum for waxing eloquent on his love for Marxism, Baseball, Current Events and whatever else tickled his fancy. One day, the self absorbed Professor picked out a question someone had anonymously submitted about Evolution. It went something like this:

"Which evolved first; the eye-ball or the eye-socket? Without the skeletal eye sockets, there is nothing to hold the eyeball in place. So if eye sockets evolved many years ahead of the eyeballs, how could blind and random Evolution have anticipated the future development of the actual eyeball? Doesn't the inter connectedness of these two separate systems suggest an Intelligent Design?"

A few of the Atheists in the class snickered, but not this one. It struck me as a very valid question and I was eager to hear Melski's answer. Though I could never quite stomach Melski's Marxism and love of Fidel Castro, his grasp of the stars, planets, orbits and so on was impressive; as was his ability to explain matters of astronomy to his students. I figured that Melski the Magnificent would easily hit this softball "out of the park". Why else would he have chosen the question?

To my surprise and disappointment, in spite of my own Atheistic pre-disposition and bias, Melski's explanation came off as convoluted, insecure and unsatisfying. It amounted to unintelligible gibberish about the systems evolving together and things happening on a molecular level, blah, blah, blah. Most telling of all was his descent into the classic logical fallacies of the 'ad hominem attack' *(ridiculing the anonymous questioner)* and the 'Straw Man Trick' *(invoking the claim of a 6000 year old Earth and the talking snake of Eden)*. Why the condescending mockery from Melski? And who said anything about the Earth's age or the story of Adam & Eve?

Soon, most of the class was laughing; feeding the Professor's bloated ego while no doubt causing the anonymous questioner to bear his humiliation in private. In that moment, I immediately recognized the phenomenon of AGR *(Authority-Groupthink-Ridicule)* at work. OMD! *(Oh My Darwin!)*. It was Sister Carmela's 1st Grade Class all over again! Thankfully, someone else was being roasted alive this time, albeit anonymously.

Authority-Groupthink-Ridicule - History repeats!

Melski's unexpected and childish appeal to Logical Fallacy left a very bad taste in my mouth, as did the mindless laughter of his giggling groupies. My own casual Atheism was soon to be tempered down to a benign Agnosticism. More significantly, this now quarter of a century ago event helped to set me on a lifelong path to using reason and logic to discern the truth about all things.

For me, the once unassailable edifice of Atheistic Evolution would turn out to be castle made of sand; supported mainly by the artificial pillars of academic groupthink, media hype, primitive reasoning, and sheer intellectual intimidation. The unique contribution of this long overdue work lies not in the case which it makes against Atheistic Evolution, but rather in the clear, concise, comprehensive and, dare I say, "Idiot-Proof" manner in which the case for Scientific-Political fraud is presented. Trust me class; this one is a keeper!

This purpose of ***God vs. Darwin*** is threefold:

1. To arm the “common man” – that perpetual object of Melski’s elitist derision – with the easy-to-use intellectual ammunition needed to hold his ground against the slick sophistry of the dogmatic Atheist

2. To illustrate the error of Atheism to any non-dogmatic Atheist / Agnostic who is willing to at least listen and hopefully rethink his position

3. To enable parents, priests, pastors etc to protect their teenagers from the predatory intolerance of Evangelical Atheists

Quite naturally, and out of necessity, ***God vs. Darwin*** will indeed touch upon matters pertaining to science and theology. But the main emphasis here will be on simple logic, reason and ‘common sense’. For this reason, your humble author believes that his work will have universal appeal to readers of all educational levels and all, if any, religious faiths.

Let’s get started.

CHAPTER 1

There Are Only Three Choices

The provocative title, ***God vs. Darwin: The Logical Supremacy of Intelligent Design Creationism over Evolution***, was not merely chosen as an attention-grabber. That was part of the reason of course, but there is more to it than that. You see, the reality of an Intelligent Designing Force, aka God, really can be proven. No, I haven't spoken to Him. And no, I haven't seen Him, neither in person nor in the form of a burning bush. Through the logical principle of 'deduction' *(elimination of the impossible)*, the Great Designing Force can be discovered and indeed, in a certain sense, *known* through the same logical principle.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, speaking through the words of Sherlock Holmes, the legendary fictional detective he had created, made the following observation about deduction:

"…when you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth." **(1)**

So, let's start by listing the *only* three options relating to this matter:

1. Intelligent Design (ID): Some sort of Intelligent Creative Force *(God)* designed the Universe and animated its life forms. **…..OR**

2. Atheistic Evolution (AE): A Godless Universe blasted itself into existence. Non-Intelligent Cosmic and Biological Evolutionary processes

blindly and randomly produced all life forms. **…….OR**

3. Theistic Evolution (TE): God brought the Universe into existence and then intelligently guided both the Cosmic and Biological Evolutionary processes which the Atheists believe to have occurred.

These are the only three choices. At face value, any of the options seems fantastical; like a fairy tale out of a children's book. On the one hand, we have this unseen magical force of unknown origination, bringing whole worlds and life forms into self-perpetuating conscious existence. At a casual glance, what rational person could believe such a thing?

On the other hand, we have nothing, and I mean absolutely *nothing*, blindly bringing whole worlds and life forms into self-perpetuating conscious existence. At a casual glance, what rational person could believe such a thing?

And on "the third hand", we have a combination of both beliefs!

And yet, the rational man *must* indeed choose between one of these three fantastic tales of Creation. Ironically, the God-believer *(regardless of his particular religion)* and the Atheist are actually both Creationists. One believes in Intelligent Creation, the other in Blind Creation.

Can deduction be used to eliminate the impossible options, leaving us no other choice but the *seemingly* implausible option? That is exactly what this work proposes to do. The elimination of "Non-Intelligent Design" *(Atheistic Evolution)* as a possibility will thus prove the inescapable reality of a certain form of "Intelligent Design" – namely, a Creative Force we can accurately call, God.

It's elementary my dear reader, elementary.

Three Options: Atheistic Evolution / Theistic Evolution / Intelligent Design

CHAPTER 2

What Do Atheistic Evolutionists Believe?

Before we can systematically apply the principles of logic to deconstruct the option of blind and “coincidental” Atheistic Evolution; let us first review the key elements which constitute the belief system in question. There is more to Atheism than just the disbelief in Intelligent Design. There are a set of positive core beliefs associated with Big Bang - Evolution as well. Any form of heresy from these dogmas is enough to get one “ex-communicated” from ranks of the “educated” Big Banger – Evolutionist Club.

The basics of Evolution must be explained not in the fallacious form of a cunning “Straw Man” rhetorical technique, but rather as an honest synopsis of how Big Bang - Evolution is actually believed to have occurred. So, back to High School Science class we go:

Once upon a time, 15 billion years ago to be precise, all matter in the universe was contained in a single point, which is considered the beginning of the universe. After the initial explosion *(The Big Bang)* and subsequent expansion, the universe cooled enough to allow the formation of particles, such as protons, neutrons, and electrons. The majority of atoms that were produced by the Big Bang are hydrogen, along with helium and traces of lithium. Giant clouds of these primordial elements later coalesced through gravity to form galaxies, stars and planets. The magnificence, symmetry, and mathematical perfection of the Universe all came about as the result of chance and elements blindly clumping into each other.

About 10 billion years after the Big Bang, Planet Earth "took shape". The new planet contained lots and lots of “Primordial Soup”; a term coined by Soviet Biologist Alexander Oparin in 1924 *(just months after Joseph Stalin came to power and placed the Sciences under his strict supervision).*

Comrade Oparin proposed that life on Earth originated and developed during the gradual chemical evolution of molecules in the Primordial Soup.

Simple organic compounds accumulated in the soup, mainly concentrated at shorelines. Eventually, more complex molecules *(polymers)*, and ultimately life itself, spontaneously, randomly, and blindly developed in the soup. The spark which started the life building process in the soup came from some form of unspecified energy. This formed amino acids, the building blocks of proteins. The proteins combined with other building blocks to form the very first living “simple” single-cell creature.

Evolutionists explain that all life on Earth is descended from that common soupy single-cell ancestor that lived 3.8 billion years ago; the “Last Universal Ancestor” (LUA). In his book *On the Origin of Species*, **Charles Darwin** *(falsely credited with originating the revolutionary idea of Evolution)* **(1)** proposed the theory of universal common descent through an evolutionary process:



“The real affinities of all organic beings, in contradistinction to their adaptive resemblances, are due to inheritance or community of descent . . .

"Therefore I should infer from analogy that probably all the organic beings which have ever lived on this earth have descended from some one primordial form, into which life was first breathed." **(2)**

The LUA is believed to have been a small, single-cell organism with a cell wall and a ring-shaped coil of DNA floating within; very similar to any modern bacteria. Over many hundreds of millions of years, soupy single-cell creatures evolved into more complex organisms that swam about in the oceans. Others branched off and became plants. Others evolved into insects and others into animals. Again, this happened all by chance and all without design.

As proof of this theory, the Evolutionist will cite the high degree of biological similarities which exist between all living creatures. Indeed, all living cells use the same basic set of amino acids. The Evolutionist thus reasons: *"Of course there is a LUA! Look at all of the physical and molecular similarities common to all living organisms."*

The fossil record, along with the comparative anatomy of present-day organisms, is also taken as evidence of the LUA. By comparing the anatomies of both modern and extinct species, paleontologists infer what they believe to the evolutionary lineages of those species.

Evolutionists believe that the gradual change in the characteristics of biological populations occurred over many hundreds of millions of years. The transformation happened by means of natural selection, a process by which genetic mutations that enhance survival and reproduction become common in successive generations of a population. Natural selection creates and preserves traits that are better "fitted" for survival of the species. This is what is meant by "Survival of the Fittest".

For example, a shorter neck ancestor of the modern Giraffe is believed to have gone extinct because it couldn't eat as many leaves as the taller mutants. The longer neck mutants would therefore survive and reproduce; passing on the new mutation to the offspring. Thus the species did evolve into new forms.

Darwin:

"As species are produced and exterminated by slowly acting and still existing causes, and not by miraculous acts of creation, and as the most important of all causes of organic change is the improvement of one organism entailing the improvement or the extinction of others." **(3)**

The difference between the mutated new versions of a given species and the suddenly unfit prior editions is so subtle as to be essentially immeasurable. But over the course of hundreds of millions of years, tiny imperceptible variations can add up to transform primordial bacteria; or amoeba-like

creatures into new creatures as diverse as men, birds, sharks, insects, trees, potatoes, etc.

Life came from non-life. Consciousness came from non-consciousness. Intelligence came from non-intelligence.



From Bang to Soup to Oceanic Slime to Leggy Fish to Ape to Beauty; all by random chance and for no apparent reason

This then is the story of random Big Bang - Evolution. If you can recite the above summary at an Ivy League cocktail party, you'll be thought to be learned and sophisticated. But any truly objective observer would have to admit, that at least at first glance, blind creation *sounds like* the stuff of fantasy. Indeed, many of Darwin's most strident 19th Century critics *(and 20th & 21st too)* were and still are serious men of science, not of religion. **(4)** Even some Unscientific Atheists will admit that the twin theories of Big Bang and cross-species Evolution *(not to be confused with minor trait adaptation)* are neither testable nor observable.

So if the Big Bang - Evolution *sounds* fantastic on its surface, and if Big Bang - Evolution is **not testable**, and if Big Bang - Evolution is **not**

observable – then why has so much mockery, ridicule, and even hatred been directed towards sincere people who simply express so much as the slightest degree of skepticism towards the Atheistic belief system? Where is that famous "tolerance" that the Atheistic "liberals" are always so piously lecturing us about?

Could it be that on a deep subconscious, shall we say, "primordial" level that the Big Banger-Evolutionists don't really believe in the basic tenets of their own religion *(Atheism)*, after all? By utilizing the basic rules of Socratic reason and logic to inquisitively press upon these insecurities, your humble author proposes to tear to tatters the classic logical fallacies which keep the dubious dogma of Darwin afloat.

In order to successfully assault the pillars of Atheism described above, a crash course on Logic Fallacies is imperative. Science class is now in recess. Let's open our Philosophy books now.

CHAPTER 3

Logical Fallacies, Cognitive Biases & Rhetorical Tricks

Nothing annoyed the Greek Philosophers of antiquity more than rhetorical devices used to manipulate arguments. Aristotle, in lamenting the use of these logical fallacies to make one's case wrote:

"We ought in fairness to fight our case with no help beyond the bare facts: nothing, therefore, should matter except for the proof of those facts." **(1)**

Unfortunately, then as now, "truth" is all too often arrived at by manipulative mathematics and deceitful debating as opposed to "bare facts". But logical fallacies are not always used with the intent to purposely deceive. Often times, the repetition of logical fallacies is simply the result of untrained thinking.

In fairness, let us graciously concede, without the least bit of reservation, the undeniable fact that Creationists will themselves often resort to logical fallacies in order to make their case. But the critical difference between the flawed logic used by *some* Creationists, as opposed to the illogic used by *all* Evolutionists, is that the former may resort to fallacies *unnecessarily*, whereas the latter must rely upon fallacies *necessarily*.

Given that the traditional defense of Big Bang-Evolution is so heavily steeped in the use of logical fallacies *(as we shall clearly see later on)*, an intellectual inoculation against the following deadly mental viruses is hereby presented for the reader's benefit.



LOGICAL FALLACIES

Argument from Fallacy: assumes that if an argument for some conclusion is fallacious, then the conclusion itself is false

Example: *"Your claim that the Earth is only 6000 years old is false. Therefore the entire case for Intelligent Design is also false."*

Argument from Personal Incredulity: the assumption that if something is impossible to imagine, then it cannot be true.

Example: *"I cannot imagine some unseen entity creating the universe."*

ad Hominem Attacks: the evasion of the actual topic by directing personal attacks at those who disagree with your conclusion.

Example: *"Uneducated people who don't believe in Evolution are crazy Bible thumping redneck morons. You're an idiot! Go read a Science book."*

Appeal to Ridicule: an argument is made by presenting the opponent's argument in a way that makes it appear ridiculous.

Example: *"My Creationist friend here believes that in a giant sky fairy waved his magic wand and made everything in 7 days."*

Personal attacks and ridicule are only Logical Fallacies when used to manipulate an argument. It is logically acceptable to use sarcasm and ridicule to expose the legitimate illogic or dishonesty of your opponent.

(as your humble, yet passionate author intends to do!)

Proof by Complexity & Verbosity: the submission of an argument too complex and verbose to counter in all its details.

Example: Just pick up a copy of Professor Steven Jay Gould's intensely verbose *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory* and see if you can even make sense of it.

Circular Reasoning: *(aka tautology)* when one begins with what he is trying to end up with; sometimes called assuming the conclusion.

Example: The rocks are old because the fossils in the rocks are old. The fossils in the rocks are old because the rocks are old.

(From Sherlock Holmes): *"It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts."*

Fallacy of Composition: assuming that something true of part of a whole must also be true of the whole.

Example: *"We now know that Darwin turned out to be right about 'X', therefore he is right about the whole Theory of Evolution."*

Truth is in the Middle Fallacy: the belief that the truth is always to be found between the two "extremes". This fallacy spares one of the trouble of thinking and also the discomfort of offending one of the "extremes".

Negative Proof Fallacy: an opinion is deemed to be correct only because it has yet to be proven false.

Example: **"***The Big Bang Theory is true because there is no proof that it is false."*

Red Herring: argument given in response to another argument, which is irrelevant and draws attention away from the subject of argument.

Example: "*We must do a better job of educating our students in Evolutionary Science if we expect them to compete in a Global economy."*

Appeal to the Majority: *(appeal to widespread belief, appeal to the majority)* a proposition is claimed to be true solely because many people believe it to be so.

Example: "*The vast majority of college educated people believe in Evolution."*

Black or White: Only two possible outcomes are presented when there are actually other possibilities.

Example: *"I don't believe in the literal Genesis description of Creation, therefore, Evolution is true*.

Appeal to Authority: an assertion is deemed true because of the position or authority of the person asserting it.

…..similar to

Appeal to Accomplishment: an assertion is deemed true or false based on the accomplishments of the proposer.

Example: "*Professor Gould was widely acclaimed as the foremost authority on Evolution. What are your credentials?"*

Appeal to Force: the use of physical force or extreme intimidation to support an argument.

Example 1: Most school districts have banned the discussion of Intelligent Design or criticism of Evolution.

Example 2: Academics who question Evolution risk damaging their career.

Appeal to Motive: a premise is dismissed by calling into question the motives of its proposer.

Example: *"These Creationists are motivated by a secret religious agenda."*

Appeal to Novelty: a proposal is claimed to be superior or better solely because it is new or modern

Example: *"I just read an article about a new study that suggests…."*

Chronological Fallacy: a thesis is deemed incorrect because it was commonly held when something else, clearly false, was also commonly held

Example: *"Up until the 1800's, many people still believed that slavery was OK, and they also believed in Creationism."*

Straw Man: an argument based on misrepresentation of an opponent's position; the building of a "Straw Man" who can then be easily knocked down.

Example: *"So, you believe in the literal interpretation of Genesis. Yet there is no evidence for talking snakes and the parting of the Red Sea. Religious allegories have no place in Science"*

How will Pauline escape this time?

'Perils of Pauline' Fallacy: This trick takes its name from an early series of silent films in which the main character, Pauline, was shown in great danger at the end of each episode; only to be rescued at the beginning of the next episode.

Objections to arguments are often neutralized by making a

concession that *seemingly* places one's own argument in danger, and then rescuing it with a diversionary ploy, usually a Red Herring or a Circular Reasoning fallacy. **This "controlled opposition" to one's own position leaves the simple-minded with the false impression that an objection has been effectively resolved; when actually; it has not been settled, *at all*!**

Example:

The Danger: *"I must confess that it is certainly true that the fossil record does not at all show that man evolved from single-cell organisms."*

The Rescue: *"But that's because the fossil record must be incomplete." (Circle Jerk)*

False Projection Fallacy: The tendency to wrongly accuse others of utilizing fallacies when they are not. In the field of psychology, this is known as projection. This can also include the invention of fallacies which really aren't fallacies at all.

Example: "*Your use of animal behavior as an argument against same-sex marriage constitutes an "Appeal to Nature Fallacy"*.

Reality: Man is a part of nature and can learn much about himself simply by observing the behavior of animals. Although the animal mind is much simpler; it is also uncorrupted by the various psychoses that afflict the overly complicated, prone-to-error, and eternally prideful human psyche.

Looking to nature is NOT a "fallacy"; it is a humble method of seeking wisdom. Of course, it is not always a perfect indicator for ideal human behavior *(Alpha male lions killing the cubs of competitors, for example)*; but to automatically dismiss any and all observations of nature as fallacious reasoning is in itself a fallacy.

COGNITIVE BIASES

Authority Bias: The tendency to believe something because some perceived authority has declared it to be so.



Bandwagon Effect: The tendency to believe things because many others among your peer group believe the same. Groupthink, lemming effect, herd mentality.

Confirmation Bias: The tendency to search for, interpret, focus on and remember information in a way that confirms one's preconceptions.

Backfire Effect: When people react to contradicting evidence by actually *strengthening* their erroneous beliefs *(a form of pride and vanity)*

Status-quo bias: Fear of changing opinions. Preference to keep things as familiar as possible.

Bias Blind Spot: The tendency to see oneself as less biased than other people, or to be able to identify more cognitive biases in others than in oneself

Observer-Expectancy: When a researcher expects a given result and therefore unconsciously manipulates an experiment or misinterprets data in order to find it

Selective Perception: The tendency for expectations to influence perception.

Cognitive Dissonance: The tendency to deny or not see evidence which contradicts a given bias. Denial

These additional terms for Cognitive Biases were coined by your humble author.

Sound & Fury Syndrome: *(aka Emperor's New Clothes Syndrome)* **-** The tendency to be influenced by the degree of loud hype and passion supporting

a belief, rather than by the actual facts of the case.

Repetition Bias: The tendency to be influenced by the repetition of an opinion, rather than by the facts. This is why there are so many ads on television.

Big Lie Vulnerability: The tendency of an otherwise skeptical person to catch a little lie, yet fall for a big lie because of the assumption that no one would dare to tell such an *audacious* lie.

Pro-Conspiracy Theory Bias: The tendency to automatically conclude, before the data is in, that something is a conspiracy.

Anti-Conspiracy Theory Bias: The tendency to automatically conclude, *even after compelling data is in*, that something is a *not* a conspiracy.

Universal Acceptance Syndrome: The tendency to believe in something just because an opposing view is seldom or ever heard.

RHETORICAL TRICKS (Verbal)

The following statements are often used to create the illusion of evidence when there really isn't any.

"The evidence is overwhelming", "The 'case is closed", "studies have shown", "The science is settled", "There is a growing consensus", "There is no longer any debate", "I refuse to dignify that with a response."

Examples (Book Titles):

Undeniable: *Evolution and the Science of Creation, By Bill Nye*

Case Closed: Lee Harvey Oswald and the Assassination of JFK, By Gerald Posner

DEBATING TRICKS (Non Verbal)

Rolling the eyes / Smirking / Shaking the head / Sighing / Table pounding / Finger wagging / Hands in the air / Cut and run

Hands in the air – finger in the face – smug arrogant smirk

You may want to ear-mark this chapter because we will be referring back to the critical points of this summary often. Bearing this lesson in logic always in mind, let us dare, with a blank and objective state of mind, to dig into the untouchable religion of Atheistic Evolution.

CHAPTER 4

THE MAGIC CHURCH OF THEORETICAL SCIENCE

Now don't be intimidated by the title of this chapter. Even your humble author will, without the slightest degree of hesitation or sense of insecurity, readily bow to the superior mathematical prowess of the High Priests of Atheistic Big Bang-ism & Evolution. But the turf upon which we must fight this epic battle for truth is the fair field of Logic, not the muddied soil of complex mathematics. *(Fallacy of Complexity & Verbosity / Chapter 3)*

As opposed to Classical Science *(Applied Science)* which relies upon experimentation and observation to probe and understand known phenomena, Theoretical Science employs assumptions, abstractions and mathematical models to explain possibilities or outcomes.

Classical Science is based upon hard facts which tell us what is actually happening. Theoretical Science, at best, tells us what *might* have happened in the past, or might happen in the future, *if* the underlying and unproven assumptions are correct.

Though it has certain deductive uses I suppose, if not applied responsibly, the various Theoretical Sciences can become the magical mathematical tool of psychological rationalization, instead of objective science. *(Circular Reasoning / Observer Expectancy (See Chapter 3)*

What good are poetic, jaw-dropping, structurally sound math equations and computer models if the underlying assumptions are based on logical fallacies, conjecture, or inaccurate assumptions arrived at by biased inference?

Imagine a “Theoretical Criminologist”, without any hard evidence, concocting a case which falsely points to you as having committed a murder 15 years ago. With the aid of math and computer models, he then recreates a hypothetical scene-of-the-crime, and “proves” how you *might have* done the crime and with this or that weapon, and this or that motive, with this or that accomplice. He presents his “findings” to a “Theoretical Prosecutor”, who then argues the case before 12 “Theoretical Jurors”; challenging you and your defense attorney to prove the theory wrong! *(Negative Proof Fallacy)*

When instructing his disciples on how to seek truth via independent thought, the Buddha warned against such type of reckless theorizing. The great philosopher and spiritual leader of the East, known as “The Enlightened One” had this to say:

“Do not go by reports, by legends, by traditions, by scripture, by logical conjecture, by ***inference***, by ***analogies***, *by agreement through pondering views (Verbosity /Complexity Fallacy)*, by ***probability***, *or by the thought.”* **(1)**

Conan Doyle’s fictional detective Sherlock Holmes, described by his sidekick, Dr. Watson, as *“the most perfect reasoning machine that the world has ever seen"*, reiterated this point in story after story:

“I never guess. It is a shocking habit — destructive to the logical faculty.” (The Sign of Four) **(2)**

“It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts. (A Scandal in Bohemia) **(3)**

Buddha and Holmes weren’t the only great minds to make such an observation. In more recent times, the great, and I mean ***great***, Nikola Tesla warned of the pitfalls of exalting mathematical conjecture above

observation, deduction and experimentation. In the realm of 20th Century invention, science and electrical engineering, Tesla was without peer.

Tesla on Theoretical Science:

"Today's scientists have substituted mathematics for experiments, and ***they wander off through equation after equation, and eventually build a structure which has no relation to reality****. The scientists from Franklin to Morse were clear thinkers and did not produce erroneous theories. The scientists of today think deeply instead of clearly.* ***One must be sane to think clearly, but one can think deeply and be quite insane."*** **(4)** (emphasis added)



*Einstein * & Hawking: "Dazzling mathematics", based on assumptions.*

* *Einstein was anti-religion with Deist/Pantheist leanings, but not an Atheist.*

Arguably the greatest scientist in all of human history, Tesla repeatedly and publicly denounced Einstein's space and time warping Theory of Relativity. In a letter to a friend, Tesla even ridiculed Einstein as "a long haired crank". **(5)** Tesla:

"Relativity is a massive deception wrapped in beautiful mathematics….Einstein is a beggar dressed in purple clothes and made king

*using **dazzling mathematics** that obscure truth."* (emphasis added) **(6)**

As difficult as it is to prove a negative, Tesla set out to refute the sacrosanct Theory of Relativity. Tesla:

"During the succeeding two years of intense concentration I was fortunate enough to make two far-reaching discoveries. The first was a dynamic theory of gravity, which I have worked out in all details and hope to give to the world very soon. It explains the causes of this force and the motions of heavenly bodies under its influence so satisfactorily that it will put an end to idle speculations and false conceptions, as that of curved space. According to the relativists, space has a tendency to curvature owing to an inherent property or presence of celestial bodies. Granting a semblance of reality to this fantastic idea, it is still self-contradictory." **(7)**

After his death, Tesla's work on the subject was never found.

Thomas Edison was also once asked for his thoughts on Einstein's theory of time and space warps. The legendary genius replied:

'I don't think anything about it because I don't understand it.' **(8)**

That's the whole point Mr. Edison. You weren't meant to.

As with skeptics of Big Bang-ism, **physicists who argue that Einstein's Theory of Relativity is flawed often cannot get their papers accepted for publication in scientific journals**. Scientists are warned that they may ruin their career prospects if they oppose Relativity. Distinguished British physicist Dr. Louis Essen stated that physicists seem to abandon all reason when considering relativity. He remarked:

"Students are told that the theory must be accepted although they cannot expect to understand it. They are encouraged right at the beginning of their careers to forsake science in favor of dogma." **(9)**

Einstein himself even admitted that his Theory of Relativity could not be proven *(and he also admitted that Tesla was the greatest scientist in the*

world). St. Albert summed up the essence of Theoretical Physics/Science with this very telling quote about his famous theory:

"No amount of experimentation can ever prove me right; a single experiment can prove me wrong." **(10)**

See how the game works? Theoretical Scientists hatch an idea based on assumptions, and then concoct a "dazzling" mathematical model to explain how it *might* be possible, and then challenge their peers to *disprove* the theory *(Negative Proof Fallacy / Chapter 3)*.

"Theoretically", a skilled mathematician could "prove" that elephants once flew by calculating how many hundreds of FPS *(flaps per second)* the massive beast would have had to flap his ears in order to achieve lift. He could also factor in the effects of varying atmospheric conditions, weight reduction and a partial hollowing-out of the elephants bone structure. Now that would certainly make for an awe-inspiring and entertaining set of math equations; but guess what? Elephants never flew!

Classical scientists such as Edison & Tesla had no use for "Theoretical Science" and "dazzling math" of Einstein.

Like giddy little teen age girls losing their minds over the latest shoe fashion or cute pop star, a number of other excitable Theoretical Scientists will swallow up the hot new theory without critical analysis. *(Innovation Fallacy / Sound & Fury Syndrome, Bandwagon Effect, Chapter 3)*

Teen Age Girls: “Oh Frankie! Oh Elvis! Oh The Beatles! Oh Van Halen! Oh the Back Street Boys! Oh Justin Bieber!”

Theoretical Scientists: “Oh Evolution! Oh Relativity! Oh Big Bang! Oh Punctuated Equilibrium! Oh Chaos Theory! Oh Global Warming!”

Add in some media hype in the Science section of the oh-so “prestigious” *New York Times* or the misnamed *Scientific American*, *(Authority Fallacy / Bandwagon Fallacy)*, along with cash grants from self-serving entities, and the Myth of the Month is out and racing towards the finish line before the “skeptic” has even entered the gate!

As for the non-scientific types who intuitively doubt “the science”, they are dismissed as *“uneducated people who do not understand the underlying Math and Science”*. *(Ad Hominem)* With this reality in mind, let us understand and never forget this critical point.

The Theoretical Physics *(dazzling math)* supporting Big Bang-ism & Big Blend-ism; and the Theoretical Biology, Geology & Chemistry supporting Darwinism, all proceed from starting points which already assume the respective theories to be true, and the existence of an Intelligent Designer to be false. *(Circular Reasoning)*

Whether deliberately or unconsciously, the *“dazzling mathematics”* is then structured to “fit” the pre-existing bias and yield an expected result to support the ‘Theory of the Month’. *(Observer Expectancy / (See Chapter 3)*

In short, the math is awesome; but the logic is lousy. Never again feel intimidated by the intellectual bullies of the various Theoretical Sciences *(Theoretical Physics, Theoretical Chemistry, Theoretical Biology, Theoretical Geology etc)*. Just stay on your friendly “home field” of sound logic, and watch how fast some of these mendacious mathematical masturbators run away in fear, but not before they call you “stupid” and “uneducated” for not being able to understand their ponderous math equations. *(Ad Hominem / Verbosity & Complexity (Chapter 3)*

Anyone, and I mean anyone, can stop the intellectual bullies of Theoretical Science dead in their tracks with one simple question. This question should be memorized and kept handy for when needed. Use it as one would use a crucifix to frighten away evil vampires. The next time an Unscientific Atheistic bully tries to throw complex jargon in your face, or smugly invokes the very term, “Science”, ask him:

“Is your belief based upon observed Science, or assumption-based Theoretical Science?”

Deer - meet headlights.

If Atheism can be described as a religion, then the Theoretical Scientists are its High Priests, “dazzling mathematics” is its holy scripture, natural history museums and planetariums are its cathedrals, repeated mantras of “Science, Science, Science, Evolution, Evolution, and Evolution” are its prayers, Saint Darwin, Saint Einstein, and Saint Hawking are its unassailable prophets, and the scientists who dare to question “Church” doctrine are its heretics.

CHAPTER 5

The Big Bang and the Big Blend

As we reviewed in Chapter 2: What Do Big Banger - Evolutionists Believe":

"Once upon a time, 15 billion years ago to be precise, all matter in the universe was contained in a single point, which is considered the beginning of the universe. After the initial explosion (The Big Bang) and subsequent expansion, the universe cooled enough to allow the formation of particles, such as protons, neutrons, and electrons. The majority of atoms that were produced by the Big Bang are hydrogen, along with helium and traces of lithium. Giant clouds of these primordial elements later coalesced through gravity to form galaxies, stars and planets. The magnificence, symmetry, and mathematical perfection of the Universe all came about as the result of chance."

First of all, the "Big Bang Theory" is neither testable nor observable. That in itself does not disprove the idea, but before we proclaim a thing to be an "indisputable fact of science", and brow beat skeptics as "uneducated", let's see some hard evidence first; or least some compelling "soft evidence". But there is no observable evidence and a few of the Big Bangists themselves even admit as much.

In May of 2004, a group of 33 top *secular* scientists signed their names to an Open Letter in which they asserted that the Big Bang Theory was invalid. Here is just the opening salvo of the blistering piece:

"The Big Bang today relies on a growing number of hypothetical entities, things that we have never observed-- inflation, dark matter and dark energy are the most prominent examples. Without them, there would be a fatal

contradiction between the observations made by astronomers and the predictions of the big bang theory.

In no other field of physics would this continual recourse to new hypothetical objects be accepted as a way of bridging the gap between theory and observation. It would, at the least, raise serious questions about the validity of the underlying theory." ….. But the Big Bang theory can't survive without these fudge factors. **(1)**

Eric J. Lerner
With a New Preface by the Author
The Big Bang Never Happened
A Startling Refutation of the Dominant Theory of the Origin of the Universe

Eric J Lerner of Lawrence Plasma Physics is just one of many scientists trying to fight Big Bang-ism

Next, there is no satisfactory explanation given for where all of this pre-Big Bang matter originated from. How did it form into such a dense point? I mean, we're talking some seriously massive amounts of matter here, all condensed in one point. You can't just ignore the pre-Big Bang period, can you?

And yet, that is exactly what the Big Bangists do. Instead of addressing these vital questions, they simply choose to ignore the origin of the existing matter of the pre-Big Bang period and the additional "can of worms" which it logically opens up. In a lecture entitled "The Beginning of Time", the

legendary, and I mean *legendary*, theoretical physicist, cosmologist and outspoken Atheist Stephen Hawking explains:

"At this time, the Big Bang, all the matter in the universe, would have been on top of itself. The density would have been infinite. …The universe will evolve from the Big Bang, completely independently of what it was like before." **(2)**

OK Mr. Hawking. Whatever your crystal ball into the past tells you, I will accept for argument's sake (*in spite of fact that many astronomers don't subscribe to Big Bang Theory)*. But please tell us about "before the Bang". What was it like in your estimation? Where did all of this bloody matter come from? How many billions of years did it take for all that stuff to accumulate and condense to such a degree that it could later fill up the current Universe?

A few lines later, the man dubbed by the press as *"the smartest man in the world"* addresses these essential questions:

"Since events before the Big Bang have no observational consequences, ***one may as well cut them out of the theory****, and say that time began at the Big Bang. Events before the Big Bang, are simply not defined, because there's no way one could measure what happened at them*." **(3)** (emphasis added)

Say what?!

Because Hawking, *by his own admission*, can neither "define" nor "measure" the events prior to the Big Bang, he simply *"cuts them out"* of cosmic history. Who is he to say that pre-Bang-ism events *"have no observational consequences"?* How can he simultaneously acknowledge that there were *"events before the Big Bang"*, and then say it doesn't count as actual "time". Who is he to unilaterally decree that *"time began at the Big Bang"* when time is infinite and open ended?

This is not scientific talk; it's Orwellian "double- think". Hawking's "15 billion years" is to eternity what a single grain of sand is to the Sahara

desert, multiplied by infinity. God Man Hawking can no more erase the pre-Big Bang time period any more than an historian can erase pre BC events. *"Disregard ancient Greece and Egypt. Those pre BC civilizations hold no 'observational consequences.'*

Inquiring minds want to know; how was all of that matter created and how did it accumulate into a single cosmic snowball? **Wouldn't the origin of the actual matter, in whatever pre-Bang form it may have existed as, represent the *true* "starting point" of the Universe?**

Why is it that fragmented matter floating through space for "15 billion years" can be defined as "the Universe", but a condensed block of that *very same matter* floating in that *very same outer space* for many years prior is not considered part of cosmic history?

Atheist Hawking skates around a Law of Thermodynamics by simply ignoring it. The law states: *"Matter and energy can be neither created nor destroyed."* This means that there is no *new* matter or energy coming into existence and no *new* matter or energy passing out of existence. The idea of the universe coming into existence *from nothing* violates the first law of thermodynamics, which was established by the very scientific community that now, for the most part, ignores it. This law suggests that the universe, and all matter and energy within it, must have had a supernatural origin which violated the law - a special moment in which matter and energy were indeed created by an Intelligent Force far beyond our understanding.

Or, could it be that matter and energy are actually eternal, and always there? Now there's a real mind bender!

In all fairness, we really can't expect Hawking, or any other scientist, to ever definitively answer such questions. But what Hawking is essentially saying is, *"Because such questions are unanswerable, let's just edit them out of our Atheistic belief system and proceed to the Big Bang of pre existing matter."* (author's words, not Hawking's)

Imagine if this were a cooking class. Chef Hawking the infallible would dismiss the creation, accumulation, mixing, and prep work of the actual

ingredients as *"having no consequence"* to the recipe. *"Just place the pre cooked lasagna in the oven and shut up"*, says the Master Chef of all Chefs.

"Hawking has spoken. Pay no attention to that man (pre-Big Bang time) behind the curtain." (author's words, not Hawking's)

But it get's weirder. The paralytic Professor then follows up with an astonishingly childish Straw Man / Black-White Combo Fallacy *(See Chapter 3)*:

"… the motion of bodies in the solar system can be extrapolated back in time, ***far beyond four thousand and four BC, the date for the creation of the universe, according to the book of Genesis****. Thus it would require the direct intervention of God, if the universe began at that date. By contrast, the Big Bang is a beginning that is required by the dynamical laws that govern the universe. It is therefore intrinsic to the universe, and is not imposed on it from outside (God)*. **(4)** (emphasis added)

Anyone can beat up a Straw Man!

Is that the best you got St. Stephen the Secular; "proving" Atheism by beating up on the Straw Man of literal Genesis fundamentalism? *(just like Professor Melski from this book's Introduction!)*

In addition to the completely dodged question of matter formation *(creation)*, is the question of how the perfect, mind boggling, Swiss watch-like harmony and symmetry of the Universe could have come forth from a massive explosion *(or even just a blind and gradual expansion as other cosmologists believe):* an event that otherwise always causes random chaos.


THE BIG BANG THEORY
TIME BEGINS
ONE SECOND
PRESENT DAY
Quarks
Neutron
Hydrogen nucleus
Hydrogen atom
Protogalaxy
Electron
Proton
Helium nucleus
Helium atom
Galaxy
1 The cosmos goes through a superfast "inflation," expanding from the size of an atom to that of a grapefruit in a tiny fraction of a second
2 Post-inflation, the universe is a seething, hot soup of electrons, quarks and other particles
3 A rapidly cooling cosmos permits quarks to clump into protons and neutrons
4 Still too hot to form into atoms, charged electrons and protons prevent light from shining; the universe is a superhot fog
5 Electrons combine with protons and neutrons to form atoms, mostly hydrogen and helium. Light can finally shine
6 Gravity makes hydrogen and helium gas coalesce to form the giant clouds that will become galaxies; smaller clumps of gas collapse to form the first stars
7 As galaxies cluster together under gravity, the first stars die and spew heavy elements into space; these will eventually form into new stars and planets

The Theoretical Scientists have the 'Big Bang' all figured out…..in their imaginations!

This portion of the post Big Bang Creation narrative can be referred to as 'The Big Blend". The Big Blend would be somewhat analogous to placing different varieties of metals and glass into a blender and pushing the "chop" button. Try this a few trillion times and eventually, some of the scattered parts will have fastened together to form a high end Rolex watch.

Granted, it's an imperfect analogy because gravitational pull of various matter is not taken into account, but you get the point. How could an explosion of condensed matter have blindly created a cosmic Rolex of perfect orbits and solar systems*? (to say nothing of where the raw materials to make the Rolex came from in the first place!)*

Actually, the random "blending" of a Rolex is a far more likely outcome than Hawking's Big Blend of the Universe's cosmic contents. Apart altogether from the size, the Universe and its harmonious elements form far more complex of an orchestra than the Rolex components do. The operation of the Rolex is actually primitive by comparison!

And if indeed the explosion / expansion of condensed matter from a certain point *("the singularity")* - did in time yield a reformed and perfect Universe, how would such an event confirm Atheism and refute Intelligent Design?

(Fallacy of Composition / Chapter 3)

Who is Hawking to rule out the possibility that an intelligent force, beyond the limited understanding of our feeble human minds, might have utilized certain dynamics of Big Blend-ism as His creation (blending) mechanism?

How did the particles (*protons, neutrons, and electrons)* form themselves? Where did the hydrogen and other gases come from? How *exactly* did they just blindly "coalesce" to form perfect galaxies, stars and planets? How does an explosion in a paint store yield perfect replicas of the Mona Lisa?

Hawking's brilliant gang of mathematical wizards, *theoretical* physicists and computer programmers are highly skilled at crafting equations and designing video games to "answer" such questions. But if Hawking's juvenile logical fallacies serve as any indication, then a reasonable person has got to suspect that said equations and cartoon animations are predicated upon predetermined assumptions *(Circular Reasoning /(See Chapter 3)*

If Hawking the Holy is capable of such colossal, indeed *comical*, lapses of logic, then what does that say about his loving legions of sycophantic groupies teaching in elite Universities across America and Europe?

One parting shot at St. Stephen Hawking. In researching the life of *"the smartest man alive"*, your nosy author unearthed this juicy little Encyclopedia nugget about the Hallucinatory Huckster:

"His (Hawking's) unimpressive (and self admitted) study habits made sitting his Finals a challenge. ***He decided to answer only theoretical physics questions rather than those requiring factual knowledge****. A first-class honors degree was a condition of acceptance for his planned graduate*

study. Anxious, he slept poorly the night before the examinations and the final result was on the borderline between first- and second-class honors, making a viva (oral exam) necessary." **(5)** (emphasis added)

And …

"Hawking's first year as a doctoral student was difficult. ……he found that his training in mathematics was inadequate for work in general relativity and cosmology." **(6)**



At Oxford, Hawking struggled with Classical Physics

So, "*the smartest man alive*" is mortal after all!

CHAPTER 6

Stalin's Primordial Soviet Soup

As we reviewed in Chapter 2: What Do Big Banger - Evolutionists Believe":

"About 10 billion years after the Big Bang, Planet Earth "took shape". The new planet contained lots and lots of "Primordial Soup"; a term coined by Soviet Biologist Alexander Oparin in 1924 (just months after Joseph Stalin came to power and placed the Sciences under his strict supervision).Comrade Oparin proposed that life on Earth originated and developed during the gradual chemical evolution of molecules in the Primordial Soup. Simple organic compounds accumulated in the soup, mainly concentrated at shorelines. Eventually, more complex molecules (polymers), and ultimately life itself, spontaneously, randomly, and blindly developed in the soup. The spark which started the life building process in the soup came from some form of unspecified energy. This formed amino acids, the building blocks of proteins, which would then evolve into all species."

Did you know that the greatest mass murderer in human history, and his henchmen, were the political force behind the fantastic tale of the Primordial Soup?

There is simply no denying nor exaggerating the extent to which Lenin, Stalin and their bloody Communist gang sought to manipulate Science to fit political abstractions. **(1)** Look up the term “Lysenkoism” in any Encyclopedia or Search Engine and see what I mean.

Lysenkoism was the centralized political control exercised over genetics and agriculture by Trofim Lysenko and his followers. Lysenko was the Director of the Soviet Union's Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences. The term Lysenkoism is used metaphorically to describe the manipulation of the scientific process in order to reach a predetermined conclusion to suit political ends. *(Deliberate Logical Fallacy, a lie!)*

Joseph Stalin made Lysenko very popular. In 1935, Lysenko compared his opponents to the peasants who still resisted the Stalin’s collectivization strategy, saying that opponents of his theories were setting themselves against Marxism. Stalin was in the audience when this speech was made, and he was the first to stand and applaud, calling out *"Bravo, Comrade Lysenko. Bravo."* **(2)**

One of Lysenko’s associates and enthusiastic supporters was Alexander Oparin, a biochemist noted for his book, *The Origin of Life*. The Communist Party's Marxist concept of “dialectical materialism” fit Oparin's view on the origins of life as *'a flow, an exchange, a dialectical unity'*.

1: The evil Stalin stands as Comrade Lysenko speaks / 2: Comrade Oparin was a dedicated Marxist and associate of Lysenko / 3: Primordial Soup and organisms form near the shore

Though Lysenkosim is now universally rejected and ridiculed, Comrade Oparin's politicized Theory of "Primordial Soup" somehow managed to live on. As with Big Bang-ism, Big Soup-ism can neither be tested nor observed in any classical scientific sense. Enter, from Stage Far Left, a Theoretical Chemist and a Theoretical Physicist to "explain" how it happened.

In 1953, Harold Urey *(chemist & physicist)* and Stanley Miller *(physicist)* conducted their famous experiment to "prove" *(rationalize)* Comrade Oparin's Primordial Soup Theory. Urey was a suspected Communist with more Communist Front affiliations that one could shake a hammer and sickle at. **(3)** Of course, this fact has absolutely nothing to do with his stellar career accomplishments; but it would account for his manifest bias against Intelligent Design *(at best)*, and quite possibly a deliberate act of Lysenkoism *(at worst)*. We will further explore this political angle in a later chapter.

The Dynamic Duo mixed gases *thought to be* present on primitive earth: Methane, Ammonia, Water, Hydrogen, but no oxygen. They then electrically sparked the mixture to mimic lightning. The results were some amino acids, the building blocks of proteins. It was later discovered that other energies such as heat and ultraviolet light also can excite gases and produce all 20 amino acids.

Like Dr. Frankenstein from the 1930's horror film, Urey & Miller, upon "proving" their predetermined belief, must have shrieked *"It's alive! It's alive!"* Urey and Miller quickly became immortalized. If there were a Big Bangist-Evolutionist Hall of Fame, the soupy scientists would be surely be enshrined alongside Darwin, Oparin, Hawking and Gould.

So, how does your humble author, whose career scientific credentials consist of a pair of "B's' in High School Biology and Chemistry, propose to dethrone these two icons of modern science? You guessed it; by spotting the *glaring* Logical Fallacies upon which their "dazzling" Communist chemistry was based.

Our brilliant Soupsters may have succeeded in forming *some* of the amino acids, but they sure had to use a whole lot of 'Intelligent Design' to do so - *theirs*! They chose the ingredients that they wanted, based on an unproven assumption of what atmospheric gases may have existed or not existed on Planet Earth. They then strategically injected the energy that they wanted, in the amount that they wanted, thus achieving a certain result that they *expected*, and no doubt also wanted. *"Dang it! It MUST work!"*

(Observer Expectancy & Confirmation Bias / (See Chapter 3)

An impressive display of Theoretical *(and Theatrical)* Chemistry gentlemen, but how the frickety-frack does your recipe for homemade amino acids prove, *or even suggest*, that all life forms originated from the Primordial Soup? How did this test prove that Comrade Oparin's Soviet Soup even existed in the first place? On what basis did you choose to included some gases, and exclude others? How do you know what the exact atmospheric composition was, or was not, at the time of Great Soupiness? Were you there?



Comrade Urey's (above) rigged experiment was pure Lysenkoism, supported by media hype.

In spite of the international hype, the two Frankensteins did not create a life form, nor did they create an actual protein. The amino acids which they engineered were only the *building blocks* of protein; which in turn are only one of the four building blocks of living cells, along with carbohydrates, lipids, and nucleic acids. This is like saying, *"We figured out how to make some bricks, sort of. Therefore, we now know how the skyscraper came about, by chance."*

Not so fast my soupy scammers. Tell us how the blueprint for the skyscraper came to be, and how the foundation was laid, and how the elaborate matrix of steel beams and trusses was manufactured and secured into place, and how the concrete floors were made, and how the elevators were installed, and how the bricks were held together, and the bolts, rivets and welding, and how the glass windows were set into place, and how the plumbing, heating, air conditioning and electrical wiring were installed – all by blind random chance.

What am I missing here gentlemen?

It's actually worse than that because we really do not even have that simple "brick" until the amino acids *spontaneously* combine to form an actual protein. You see, the amino acid is not an actual structure. It's just a building

block of a building block of a building block. One protein = 100 amino acids of 20 varieties. Let's see Urey & Miller manipulate amino acids to form an actual protein, at a probability of 10^{130} ! To give you an idea of what those odds actually are, just 10^{14} = 1 in 100 Trillion. And then we have to account for the odds of that single protein "clicking" the right way and combining with the other building blocks.

Suffice it say that any interpretation of Urey & Miller's soupy stunt that jumps from the manipulated, *intelligent* formation of a few amino acids, all the way to the spontaneous building of a single protein, to the spontaneous formation of single cell life form *(with a complex DNA structure / genetic code already embedded within its cell walls*, to the formation of all life forms - constitutes a leap of faith that can only be described as religious fanaticism; the religion being Unscientific Atheism.

Forget the soup, this is just plain "nuts"!

CHAPTER 7

Darwin's Theory of Marilyn and the Maggot

As we reviewed in Chapter 2: What Do Big Banger - Evolutionists Believe:

"Evolutionists go on to explain that all life on Earth is descended from a common soupy ancestor that lived approximately 3.8 billion years ago; the "Last Universal Ancestor" (LUA).

As proof of this theory, the Evolutionist will cite the high degree of biological similarities which exist between all living creatures. Indeed, all living cells use the same basic set of amino acids. The Evolutionist thus reasons: "Of course there is a LUA! Look at all of the physical and molecular similarities common to all living organisms."

Just watch any animal show on TV and take note of how many times the narrator reverentially invokes "Darwinian Evolution". Visit any zoo or aquarium and you'll hear the tour guides repeat how this or that animal "evolved". And yet, evidence of how this unguided, blind development of complex creatures actually occurred are never given; neither on TV, nor in zoos, nor in University classrooms. The lack of specifics regarding the multi-million year transition from ocean slime to animal doesn't matter to the evolutionist because everything is just *assumed* to have "evolved" into existence. *(Universal Acceptance Syndrome – Chapter 3)*

We have all seen, on countless occasions, the iconic Human Evolution chart depicting the transition from small ape to fully erect man. At a casual glance, it seems almost plausible, doesn't it? After all, the similarities between ape and man are indeed striking; which proves, well, that the similarities between ape and man are indeed striking. So what? There are some "striking" differences too, I would point out!

Only someone afflicted with Evolutionary Confirmation Bias *(Chapter 3)* would automatically jump to the conclusion that man therefore "evolved" from apelike creatures. Would it not be reasonable to suggest that *if* an Intelligent Being designed the various life forms, He would have used certain basic structures as His biological templates?

Despite huge differences in appearance, size, performance, functionality etc, a Ferrari Sports Car still has much in common with a Yellow School Bus *(wheels, combustion engine, transmission, battery, gas tank, brakes, steering wheel, seats, etc)*. Did the Ferrari therefore "evolve" from the Bus? Or was it simply a case of a common structure for all Motor Vehicles, originating from the minds of the men who invented the modern wonder of automobiles?

Proof of unintelligent Automobile Evolution? Not exactly.

The Evolution Chart is not a "smoking gun". The chart is 'Theoretical Artwork', based on unproven assumptions, promoted by unquestioning academic and media hype, which will viciously denounce you as "uneducated" if you doubt its premise.

By starting the transition with a small ape on all fours, the cunning creators of the Evolution Chart cleverly gave themselves, what they believed to be, a 3 billion year head start. A more honest representation would have depicted a single cell amoeba *(Universal Common Ancestor)*, followed by a fish,



followed by a slithering ape-fish combo, followed by an ape, and finally a modern man.

But such a chart would not seem plausible. Indeed, if such a shocking depiction were to be hyped as much as the one we are all familiar with, public belief in the ‘soup to man’ transition would surely erode.

So, for the sake of the visually impressed, let us be crystal clear about what Atheistic Evolution actually means. Here it is, in bare, naked and honest form.

Imagine if we were to trace the family tree of legendary beauty Marilyn Monroe, to her mother, to her grandmother, to her great grandmother, to her great - great grandmother, to her great grandmother [(x)].

Then imagine tracing the family tree of a disgusting maggot that is currently boring its way through the rotting carcass of some 1 week old road-kill, to its mother *(a fly)*, to its fly grandmother, to its fly great grandmother, to its fly great - great grandmother, to its fly great grandmother [(y)] - until we ultimately meet the same creature that lovely Marilyn had led us to. You see, according to Darwin, Marilyn and the maggot are distant cousins!



Please don't swat flies anymore. That baby maggot could one day "evolve" into every man's dream.

Now before you Atheistic Evolutionists accuse your humble author here of using the "Appeal to Ridicule" or "Straw Man" fallacies; stop and ask yourself; is it true, or not true, that you believe in Darwin's tale of Marilyn & the Maggot? True or false? No "but…but…but" – just answer the damn question!

Similar trips through our time machine would yield a myriad of other shocking intersecting encounters; the Elephant and the Butterfly, the Ant and the Oak Tree, the Bunny Rabbit and the Tyrannosaurus Rex, and on and on and on.

But let's be fair, and give Mr. Darwin an opportunity to present his case. Sir Charles, let's you and this street smart city boy from New Jersey have a little chitchat, man to man.

CHAPTER 8

Darwin Destroys Evolution with His Own Words

*** The words of Naturalist / Geologist Charles Darwin *(in Italics)* are pulled from his famous: *On the Origin of Species*, (1859).**

Your author's sarcastic responses appear in regular text.

"We ought to be extremely cautious in saying that any organ or instinct, or any whole being, could not have arrived at its present state by many graduated steps." **(1)**

Sorry Mr. Darwin. Science doesn't work that way. There is this concept known as "The Scientific Method', perhaps you should Google it, which actually *requires* that a hypothesis be put through the ringer of experimentation, observation, skepticism, testing, probing, and prodding. Only after such a process is completed can a discovery truly be classified as scientific. By asking us to apply "extreme caution" not to the belief in Evolution, but rather to the *disbelief* in the idea, you are turning the Scientific Method upside down. The burden of proof is upon you, not us. *(Negative Proof Fallacy).*

And Chuckie-baby, where is *your* "extreme caution" in boldly declaring that man evolved from primordial single-celled slime? *(Bias Blind Spot / Chapter 3)* Tell me about Marilyn and the Maggot.

"The real affinities of all organic beings, in contradistinction to their adaptive resemblances, are due to inheritance or community of descent" **(2)**

And how exactly did you arrive at such a conclusion. Based on what science?

*"I should **infer** from **analogy** that **probably** all the organic beings which have ever lived on this earth have descended from some one primordial form, into which life was first breathed."* **(3)** (emphasis added)

Whoah Chuckie! Slow down there tiger! *"infer"?… "analogy"?…."probably"?* Sorry Chuck. That's not science. That's **conjecture** and you bloody well know it. What happened to that "extreme caution" that you cautioned your doubters against?

Wait a second! Where have we heard those words *"infer"… "analogy" ... "probably"* used in a same sentence before? Let me think. Of course! It was in the previous chapter, where **the Buddha used those *exact* words, in the same order, when instructing his disciples on right thinking**. Again, here is what "The Enlightened One" taught:

"Do not go by reports, by legends, by traditions, by scripture, by logical conjecture, by ***inference***, by ***analogies***, *by agreement through pondering views (Complexity Fallacy),* by ***probability***, *or by the thought."* **(4)** (emphasis added)

Chuckie! You not only stood Science on its head, but you turned 2500 years of Buddhist wisdom upside down and inside out. Every philosophical error that Buddha warned his pupils to avoid, you, *by your own admission,* just embraced!

Continue, Chuckie.

*"There are, it must be admitted, cases of **special difficulty on the theory** of natural selection; and one of the most curious of these is the existence of two or three defined castes of workers or sterile females in the same community of ants **but I have attempted to show how this difficulty can be mastered."*** **(5)** (emphasis added)

So you found some *"special difficulties"* with your theory; and then *"attempted to show"* how the *"difficulty"* could be *"mastered"?* Of course, such *"difficulties"* couldn't possibly be the result of your theory being incorrect in the first place! A bit of "Theoretical" Science can solve anything, eh Chuck? *(Confirmation Bias / Observer Expectancy)*

Speaking of "difficulties", how does one "master" the problem of the *millions* of missing links, both living and in fossil form, that would had to have existed during the Evolutionary development of all creatures. Where is the fossil of the creature that linked Marilyn & the Maggot, and the millions in between?

*"**An <u>interminable</u> number** of intermediate forms must have existed, linking together all the species in each group by gradations as fine as our present varieties, it may be asked, **Why do we not see these linking forms all around us?** Why are not all organic beings blended together in an inextricable chaos?"* **(6)**

(emphasis added)

That's what I just said Chuck! Where are these *"interminable number"* of linking forms? *(Here comes the "Perils of Pauline" rescue.)*

*"With respect to existing forms, we should remember that **<u>we have no right to expect</u>** (excepting in rare cases) to discover directly connecting links between them, but only between each and some extinct and supplanted form. Even on a wide area, which has during a long period remained continuous, and of which the climate and other conditions of life change insensibly in going from a district occupied by one species into another district occupied by a closely allied species, **<u>we have no just right to expect</u>** often to find intermediate varieties in the intermediate zone."* **(7)** (emphasis added)

Oh. I get it. *"We have no just right to expect"* any actual evidence. Pauline lives! Pardon me for being so impertinent. From now on, I shall just take your word at face value, giving "extreme caution" to any of lingering skepticism in my uneducated mind.

Seriously class, imagine a prosecuting attorney telling the jury in a murder case, *"We have no just right to expect any evidence connecting the defendant to the crime. Yes, it must be admitted, there are serious 'difficulties' with the State's case ("Perils of Pauline"), but we can still infer his guilt by analogy."*

Back to our conversation with St. Darwin the Infallible:

Mr. Darwin, how does your theory account for the integrated complexity of all living systems? Take for example, the eye. The eye has so many highly complex and fully integrated elements and functions to it. How could all of these elements have blindly "evolved" independent of one another?

"To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, ***I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree."*** **(8)** (emphasis added)

That's exactly what I say! *(Now watch as the sophist Darwin cleverly completes yet another "Perils of Pauline" Rescue Trick, with a bit of Latin thrown for the benefit of the simple-minded and the easily impressed.)* Darwin again:

"When it was first said that the sun stood still and the world turned round, the common sense of mankind declared the doctrine false; but the old saying of Vox populi, vox Dei, as every philosopher knows, cannot be trusted in science." **(9)**

Irrelevant! *(Banging gavel)* I didn't ask you about Galileo. I asked you to explain the integrated complexity of eye within the context of Evolution. And knock it off with the Latin Red Herring!

"Reason tells me, that if numerous gradations from a simple and imperfect eye to one complex and perfect can be shown to exist, each grade being useful to its possessor, as is certainly the case; if further, the eye ever varies and the variations be inherited, as is likewise certainly the case and if such

variations should be useful to any animal under changing conditions of life, then the difficulty of believing that a perfect and complex eye could be formed by natural selection, though insuperable by our imagination, should not be considered as subversive of the theory." **(10)**

Chuckie saves Pauline!

Again and again and again, the "Perils of Pauline" strategy that Darwin employs throughout his book begins by making a large concession, but then reassures us that once we understand his way of seeing things the objections will disappear. Repeatedly, he puts his own the theory at risk through these seemingly damaging admissions, but then he "rescues it" with a Red Herring or a Circle Jerk. While on the one hand he appeals to reason, his "reason" involves nothing more than an overly active imagination coupled with the killer debating tactics that slippery sleazy sophists are notorious for.

When discussing the fossil record, Darwin again utilizes the "Perils of Pauline" rhetorical device. Observe.

Mr. Darwin, why doesn't the geological fossil record reveal the "*interminable number*" of missing links you mentioned? I mean, our museums are full of fossils of so many extinct species. Why are the fossils of some species so abundant, whereas those of other "missing links" are not at all visible in the geological strata?

"On this doctrine of the extermination of an infinitude of connecting links, between the living and extinct inhabitants of the world, and at each successive period between the extinct and still older species, why is not every geological formation charged with such links? Why does not every collection of fossil remains afford plain evidence of the gradation and mutation of the forms of life? ***We meet with no such evidence, and this is***

the most obvious and forcible of the many objections urged against my theory." **(11)** (emphasis added)

Oh, so I wasn't the first to notice this little "difficulty"! Tell me Sir. How did you "master" this problem?

"I can answer these questions and grave objections only on the supposition that ***the geological record is far more imperfect than most geologists believe****….* **(12)** (emphasis added)

Of course! It's not the theory of Darwin the Great that is imperfect; it's the geological record that is "imperfect"! Brilliant! And the record is not merely imperfect, but actually *"far more imperfect"* than those bloody idiot geologists even realize. Pauline lives another day!

"That the geological record is imperfect all will admit; but that it is imperfect ***to the degree which I require****, few will be inclined to admit."* **(13)** (emphasis added)

Uh, Chuck; perhaps you shouldn't use loaded terms like ***"to the degree which I require"***. A mere mortal lacking in "extreme caution" might come away with the impression that you are manipulating perceptions to fit a theory that you just can't let go of. …Just sayin.

If we look to long enough intervals of time, geology plainly declares that all species have changed; and have changed in the manner ***which my theory requires****, for they have changed slowly and in a graduated manner*. **(14)** (emphasis added)

Wait a minute! You just said, clearly and unequivocally, that the geological record contradicted your theory only because the record was "*far more imperfect*" than the majority of your scientific peers even realize. Now you're stating that the very same flawed geological record "*plainly declares*" that your theory is right?

You say that your scientific peers "*have no just right to expect*" the "*imperfect*" geological record to refute your theory, yet you maintain the

"just right" to manipulate, as *"required"*, that very same *"imperfect"* record to "prove" *your* theory. This is Orwellian double-think.



Shhh. Please don't tell anyone I'm a fraud.

Mr. Darwin, you're even nuttier than Messrs. Oparin, Hawking, and Urey. Either that or you're a bloody con man in search of undeserved fame. It is not clear if you belong in an insane asylum or a prison cell; but this self-contradicting rubbish certainly doesn't belong in our Schools and Universities; unless it's used to teach students a lesson in Logical Fallacies, or psychosis.

Charles Darwin; are you sure your name isn't *Charles Dickens*? At least his tall tales have a moral component. Good day Sir!

So there you have it folks; the Great Charles Darwin exposed like the Great Wizard of Oz. One can read the entire *On the Origins of Species* on the Internet *(as I have*), and note the ***infestation*** of Logical Fallacies, Cognitive Biases and qualifying statements that appear throughout its verbose pages. *(Complexity & Verbosity / Chapter 3)*

Darwin's bizarre self-discrediting begins right in the introduction. What follows here is an astonishing excerpt. Read it slowly:

*"This Abstract, which I now publish, **must necessarily be imperfect**. I cannot here give references and authorities for my several statements; and I must trust to the reader reposing some confidence in my accuracy. **No doubt errors will have crept in**, though I hope I have always been cautious in trusting to good authorities alone. I can here give only the general conclusions at which I have arrived, with a few facts in illustration, but which, **I hope, in most cases will suffice**. No one can feel more sensible than I do of the necessity of hereafter publishing in detail all the facts, with references, on which my conclusions have been grounded; and I hope in a*

future work to do this. ***For I am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in this volume on which facts cannot be adduced, often apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived****. A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question; and* ***this cannot possibly be here done***. **(15)** (emphasis added)

In other words: *"This isn't actual science. I'm just going to throw some speculative crap against the wall here to see if anything sticks. Don't hold me to any of this."*

Nevertheless, Darwin's book was gobbled down and *uncritically* hyped by certain academic elites, newspapers and, oddly enough, by Communists and Anarchists. Communist icons Karl Marx and Freidrich Engels instantly became huge fans and heavily promoted Darwin's ideas to their legions of Red revolutionaries. **The fact that the political Left, for its own ulterior purposes, gave a *huge* early boost to Darwinism is absolutely undeniable**. The details of, and motives for, the Marxist obsession with Evolution will be explored in a later chapter.

Despite some very critical opposition by many within the scientific community, **(16)** Darwin's new dogma started to catch on like a new style of women's shoes. *(Appeal to Novelty / Chapter 3)* In 1911, the deceased deceiver had an important port town named after him; Darwin, Australia.

At most, all Darwin ever succeeded in demonstrating was that minor variations and adaptations *within a species* can occur through the 'Survival of the Fitness" phenomena *(Darwin's Finches)*. For example, suppose we were to insert a mixed racial population of humans into sunny Central Africa, under primitive conditions. As the centuries pass, the freckled faced, milky-white redheads within the group would probably have migrated north; lest their race burn up and die of skin cancer.

The melanin rich Blacks, on the other hand, could adapt well to the sunny heat and remain in Africa; as their red headed ex-neighbors now prosper and reproduce in the cooler climate of Europe. That's all that "Natural Selection" and "Survival of the Fittest" means. It doesn't mean that red-

headed parents started giving birth to pure Black babies or vice versa, let alone birth whole new species!

To suggest that the tiny differences in the variety of the beaks observed in “Darwin’s Finches”, each well adapted to the local food supply, somehow proves that soupy cells evolved into fish, into ape, and into man, is an irresponsible and preposterous leap of faith that should be *deservedly* denounced; not with “extreme caution”, but with “extreme ridicule”.



For having made the earth-shaking, jaw-dropping, eye-popping “discovery” of tiny variations in finch beaks, Chuckie Darwin got a beautiful Australian Port city named after him.

Don’t worry Pauline. It’s all just a show.

CHAPTER 9

Haeckel’s Hideous Hoax

In addition to manipulating geology, Darwin also jumped to erroneous conclusions about embryology *(“extreme caution” be damned!)*. He wrote that embryological evidence was *"second to none in importance"* and claimed that similarities between embryos of various creatures proved that they were related by Evolution. By 1864, Darwin would have a true giant of biology on his side, **Ernst Haeckel**.



Haeckel was a German biologist, naturalist, philosopher, physician, professor and artist who discovered and named thousands of new species. When a man of Haeckel’s stature jumps aboard a bandwagon, other scientists sit up and take notice. This “lemming effect” is a psychological phenomenon, not an intellectual one. As such, a scientist is just as vulnerable to peer-pressure as a fashion obsessed teen age girl.

During the period of 1866-1867, Haeckel visited Darwin’s home in England, where he met with both Darwin and his “bulldog” Thomas Huxley. It was in 1866 that Haeckel popularized the Theory of Embryonic Recapitulation; a theory which claims that higher life forms pass through the previous evolutionary chain before birth. The “evidence” of this theory is that various animal embryos appear similar to human embryos in the earliest stages. *(Confirmation Bias, Selective Perception / Chapter 3)*

In 1868, Haeckel published a bestselling illustrated book entitled *The History of Creation*. The images of the primordial creatures came straight out of Haeckel's vivid imagination, with no scientific basis behind them whatsoever. But who needs evidence? He's the great Haeckel, after all. Darwin and Huxley promoted Haeckel's work to their own groupies as Haeckel returned the favor.



Haeckel's 'Tree of Life': Rooted in pure Fantasy!



Meet our ancestors? Haeckel was also a "Theoretical" Artist

To further support this theory, Haeckel during the 1870's, drew a series of embryos purporting to be of different species, including humans. **It was later discovered that Haeckel had faked the embryo drawings which he used as evidence for the theory. (1)** Haeckel's scientific peers publicly charged him with committing fraud. At first Haeckel defended himself by denouncing his detractors as having a religious agenda *(Appeal to Motive Fallacy / Chapter 3)*. Eventually, Haeckel had to admit that his drawings were grossly inaccurate. He apologized for his "extremely rash foolishness"

but never admitted to the deliberate fraud which the incredibly fantastical embryo images clearly prove.

The main arguments for Haeckel's Embryonic Recapitulation in humans were the embryonic "gill slits" *(left over from our fish stage)*, "yolk sac" *(left over from our reptile stage)*, and "tail" *(left over from our monkey stage)*. But Mr. Haeckel's theory also had "difficulties".

Actually, our "fishy" embryonic "gill slits" are not slits for breathing. **They have no respiratory function**. They are actually four pairs of pouches: the 1st pair becomes germ-fighting organs; the 2nd, ear canals; the 3rd and 4th become the parathyroid and thymus glands.

Our "reptilian" embryonic yolk sac does not store food *(in reptilian fashion)* because the mother provides this to the baby. The "yolk sac" is not a yolk sac at all. Its function is to produce the first blood cells.

Our "monkey tail" is not a vestigial tail at all; just the tip of the spine extending beyond the undeveloped muscles of the embryo. The end of this will eventually become the coccyx, which enables humans to stand and sit down as we do.



HAECKEL'S FRAUD
Pharyngeal arches are not "gill slits", even in faked drawings.
Deception to make people believe evolution is a good thing, yes?

Haeckel's historical contribution to furthering the deception of Darwinian Evolution cannot be exaggerated. By lending his great name and his fake

drawings to Darwin's cause, Haeckel "made it safe" for other men of science to join "the tide of history".

What possessed a man of Haeckel's stature to not only abandon his common sense, but to go so far as to publish fake drawings? Was someone pulling his strings? Or could he have been so blinded to his own biases that he rationalized the fraud as a sort of ends-justify-the-means form of artistic persuasion?

Incredibly, in spite of the fraud, Haeckel's Embryonic Recapitulation theory survives to this day! Rather than his name being universally linked to scientific fraud, Haeckel actually has a mountain named after him; Mount Haeckel in California, located 1 mile southeast of Mount Darwin! **(2)**

Mount Haeckel / Mount Darwin

CHAPTER 10

The Evolution of Evolution

The amusing irony of "The Theory of Evolution" *(bow your head in reverence as you speak that phrase)* is that the theory *itself* is constantly "evolving". From the time of Darwin's admitted "difficulties" in accounting for the lack of transitional fossils found in the geological record, down through the present day, the High Priests of Atheism have struggled with the "difficulty" in accounting for not merely *the* missing link, but rather the *millions* of missing links.

GEOLOGY FOR SCIENCE DUMMIES

The litany of logical fallacies, errors, rationalizations and outright lies represents a truly astonishing testament to the folly of man. Let's begin with the Fallacy of Circular reasoning being used to determine the age of rocks and fossils.

The use of the geological record to establish the age of fossils is an exercise in Circular Reasoning. If you strip away the clever camouflage *(Complexity & Verbosity Fallacy / Chapter 3)*, you will see that the Darwinists argue that fossils are 100 million years old because they are found in rocks that were formed 100 million years ago. The rocks are known to be 100 million years old because they contain the bones of dinosaurs that died 100 million years ago. The fossils are old because the rocks are old. The rocks are old because the fossils are old.

To an Atheistic Darwinist, the fossils are the definitive measure of age. It does not matter what the other evidence suggest. The ages as determined by the fossils in the rock are said to be conclusive. See if you can spot the fallacy in the following explanation *(quoted in Italics)*, contained a textbook

chart entitled "Dating Rocks By Fossils". Your humble author's biting sarcasm follows in regular text.

"We know, for example, that the multi-legged sea animals called trilobites were abundant from Cambrian to early Devonian times -590 to 408 million years ago-and continued until the Permian-up to 248 million years ago. **(1)**

"We know"? What do you mean "we know"? Exactly how do "we know" that these sea animals are 500 million years old? Do the fossils of our creepy crawly common ancestors come with a Birth Certificate?

Therefore, if we find the fossil of a trilobite in a rock we can say that the rock is most likely Cambrian, Ordovician, or Silurian in age, although it may be Devonian, Carboniferous, or Permian. If we can identify the trilobite, that will be better still." **(2)**

Oh, I get it now. The rocks are old because "we know" that the fossils are old. The fossils are old because the rocks are old, due to the fossils being old. Circular Reasoning on steroids!





Yet another "difficulty" arises when we probe the assumptions regarding sediment depth as it relates to the age of rocks.

If sediments accumulate at a steady rate, *and if* they compact at a constant rate as they turn to stone, *and if* they did not erode, then we might be able to measure time by studying sediment depth. If we could assume that muddy sediments accumulate at a constant rate of 30 feet per 1 million years, for

instance, then 300 feet of mudstone would represent 10 million years of time. Simple, right?

In practice, however, it’s not that simple. There are “difficulties” with such assumptions; and lots of them too. It is in fact impossible to gauge absolute time in this manner. First of all, sediments do not accumulate at a constant rate in any environment. During a flood, a river can deposit 10 feet of sand in its channel in just a few days, whereas in the years between floods it will deposit only a few inches of sand.

Even in the ocean, where it may take 1000 years to deposit a fraction of an inch of mud, sedimentation is unsteady. The thickness of ocean sediment can’t be used for precise, or even estimated timekeeping. In addition, the rate at which sediment is deposited varies greatly in different environments. And if we take account the very likely possibility of massive worldwide disasters *(great floods, pole shifts, climate shifts, asteroid strikes, and God only knows what else)* there is no telling what impact such epic events might have had on our sedimentary timekeepers.

Furthermore, the rock record does not tell us how many years have passed between periods of deposits. In many places, the floor of a river receives sediment only during floods. The times *between* floods cannot be represented by any sediment. Over the course of Earth's history in various places, there have been long periods in which no sediments were deposited at all. In other places and times, sedimentary rocks have been worn away by erosion. Although geologists can sometimes *guess* where a gap in the record occurs, we cannot say how long of an interval it represents.

So you see my dear Darwinists, neither the fossil record nor sediment depths can establish the age of rocks. I’m afraid you’ll have to bring in a ‘Theoretical Geologist” to “infer” a solution to these little “difficulties”.

PILTDOWN MAN TO THE RESCUE!

In 1912, the pro Darwinist elements of the world press hyped up the discovery of the fossilized remains of an "apelike human ancestor". The skull and jawbone of this "missing link" were discovered in a gravel pit in

Piltdown, England. Despite the efforts of several scientists to debunk "Piltdown Man", it would take 41 years before Piltdown Man was to be exposed as a hoax (1953); an artistic combination of an orangutan jawbone, chimpanzee teeth, and a human skull. **(3)** The original forger was never discovered.

Respected Scientists fell for the hoax.

The Piltdown Man Hoax succeeded so well because much of the press and the scientific community *wanted to believe* that it was Darwin's 'Missing Link". *(Confirmation Bias / Observer Expectancy / Chapter 3)*.

Other Cognitive Biases at play were Big Lie Vulnerability, Sound & Fury Bias, and Anti-Conspiracy Theory Bias.

During its amazing 41 year run, the Piltdown Hoax did much to prop up Darwinism and undermine belief in God. **The ultimate exposure of the deliberate Piltdown fraud did not receive anywhere near the degree of hype that the original perpetration of the fraud had**. As a result, in much of the public mind, the deceptive damage from the hoax was never undone.

THE SCOPES "MONKEY TRIAL"

At a time when the Piltdown Man was still accepted as a legitimate scientific find, a substitute high school teacher, John Scopes, was accused of violating Tennessee's Butler Act, which made it unlawful to teach Evolution in any state-funded school. The trial was deliberately staged in order to attract publicity to Evolution. Scopes himself was unsure whether he had even taught Evolution, but he deliberately incriminated himself so that the test case could have a defendant. Scopes was found guilty and fined $100, but the verdict was overturned on a technicality.

160,782 The Des Moines Register CITY FINAL

DARROW VS. BRYAN ON BIBLE

Scopes' Lawyer Puts Commoner on Stand As Witness

SAYS RAILWAYS DISCRIMINATE AGAINST IOWA

Jardine Pledges His Support for Co-operatives

WAITING

DARROW CITED FOR CONTEMPT, BUT GETS OFF

Biggest Day of the Trial at a Glance

JOSHUA COULD STOP THE SUN, BRYAN AVERS

EXPLAINS BIBLE CREATION STORY

COOLIDGE SEIBS CHINA DEBT BACK

Japan Warns China Against Treaty Talk

HOWARD TESTIFY IN RUM EXPOSE

The Scopes Trial was a HUGE historical event.

But the trial, provocatively brought forward by the pro-Communist ACLU *(American Civil Liberties Union)* served its purpose of drawing national publicity. Big name reporters flocked to Dayton, Tennessee to cover the famous lawyers who represented each side. William Jennings Bryan, three-time presidential candidate, argued for the prosecution, while the ACLU's Clarence Darrow, the famed defense attorney, defended Scopes.

The highlight of the case was Darrow's theatrical cross examination of Bryan, the prosecuting attorney! Darrow was able to confound Bryan by forcing him to defend the literal interpretation of Genesis *(Straw Man Fallacy / Black-White Fallacy, Chapter 3)*

Attacks on Bryan by the National Press were as frequent as they were vicious. *Life* Magazine awarded Bryan the "Brass Medal of the Fourth Class," for having:

"…successfully demonstrated by the alchemy of ignorance that hot air may be transmuted into gold, and that the Bible is infallibly inspired except where it differs with him on the question of wine, women, and wealth." **(4)**

Even the European press slammed Bryan with condescending sarcasm.

Thirty years later, the Broadway play *Inherit the Wind* (1955) was based on the trial. It turned Darrow and Bryan into characters named Henry Drummond and Matthew Brady. The play caricatured Bryan *(Brady)* even more viciously than the Yellow Press of 1925 had done. Brady is depicted as a foaming at the mouth, bible thumping lunatic, bearing no resemblance whatsoever to the true events of the trial. In the actual trial, Darrow may

have gotten the best of Bryan, but never did Bryan act like the stark raving madman depicted in *Inherit the Wind*.

Inherit the Wind was later made into a 1960 film starring Spencer Tracy as Drummond and Fredric March as Brady. There have also been *three additional* television versions, always starring big name Hollywood 'A Listers' as Melvyn Douglas and Ed Begley in 1965, Jason Robards and Kirk Douglas in 1988, and Jack Lemmon and George C. Scott in 1999. The childish 'Straw Man' game of bashing Brady-Brian is always the same. **What was ultra liberal Hollywood's obsession with producing, and hyping, so many *Inherit the Wind* films?**

Of course, there has never been a film to portray the bizarre beliefs of Mr. Darwin.

Oh what your sarcastic author wouldn't give to be able to travel back in time and publicly cross examine *Mr. Darrow* about Stalin's Soup, the "spontaneously" appearing, self replicating DNA computer code of that very first cell, and, of course, Marilyn & the Maggot!



The lunatic character Brady is depicted waving a fan that reads: "Compliments of Mason's Funeral Parlor".

STEVEN JAY GOULD PROPOSES "PUNCTUATED EQUILIBRIUM"

Broadway plays, media hype and Hollywood films may have sufficed to predispose much of the general public towards the acceptance of Evolution as a proven fact; but more than 100 years after Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, the "difficulties" of his theory and the "imperfections" of the geological record remained. A century of incessant digging had put to rest the Darwinists' preposterous predictions of pending fossil record evidence. Millions of fossils after Darwin, we now have "*every just right*" to question Darwin's daydreams.

There is still no fossil evidence "*connecting together all forms of life by the finest graduated steps."* Out of the countless fossils in the world, not one transitional chain of species can be definitively identified as such. All known species seem to appear *abruptly* in the fossil record, without intermediate forms; thus pointing away from Darwin's "Marilyn & the Maggot" theory, and toward special creation of each species instead. Facts are stubborn things, eh Chuck.

Enter, again and as always, from stage Left, Harvard hot shot and modern legend, Steven Jay Gould – self described as the "left-of-center" son an admitted Marxist **(5)**. In 1971, Gould, a paleontologist and evolutionary biologist, teamed up with Niles Eldridge to develop *(invent)* a shiny new, super duper, new and improved, better than ever theory of Evolution - "Punctuated Equilibrium".

According to this new "Theory of the Day", evolutionary changes do not occur as slowly, gradually and "immeasurably" as the great Darwin had proposed.

Gould was now arguing that changes occurred relatively rapidly, alternating with long periods of evolutionary stability. Punctuated Equilibrium is, for example, a bird giving birth to a 'birdish' looking mammal, thus leaving no



Gould was hyped by Newsweek

transitional fossils in the geological record.

By claiming that Evolution occurred in rapid spurts, in disconnected eras of time, the 'Punk Ekers' thus solved the "difficulty" of accounting for the millions of missing links not found in the fossil record.

What Gould and Eldridge were really saying is: *"You see, because the periods in which rapid evolutionary changes occurred were so spread apart (punctuated), there weren't millions of transitional species after all; hundreds of thousands maybe, but not millions. That's why the fossil record doesn't show the missing links among Marilyn & the Maggot."* (author's words, not of Gould-Etheridge)

And just like that, a vexing century-old Darwinian "difficulty" was "solved" for good. Predictably, Academia and the Media jumped on board this latest trendy theory *(Appeal to Novelty, Confirmation Bias, and Observer Expectancy)* Most of the lesser man-gods of science quickly, and obediently, followed suit *(Bandwagon Effect, Appeal to Accomplishment, Sound & Fury Syndrome)*

But even many Evolutionists still disagree with Gould. You see, PE has its own set of "difficulties". Though the number of transitional species would be greatly reduced under Gould's model, it would still have to represent an enormous amount of species. Even a crackpot like Gould wouldn't dare to suggest that a baby ape with fins suddenly emerged from a fish egg. So, the question of massive *(though fewer)* numbers of missing links still remains a "difficulty."

Another “difficulty” would involve the case of, say, a bird bearing a mammal. For this “mutation” to “change” the rest of the species, another mammal of the same kind, of the opposite sex, must be born at the same time in the same area in order for the new and improved species to continue. The “difficulties” in overcoming the odds of just one organism appearing this way, let alone two, are indeed challenging. But the dauntless Gould carried on with his written ranting for 30 more years, publishing one verbose volume after another on the subject. *(Fallacy of Verbosity & Complexity)*

In April 2000, one month before his death, the US Library of Congress officially declared Gould to be a "Living Legend" **(6)**. A ‘Living Liar” award would have been far more appropriate.

CHAPTER 11

The Fallacy of the “Simple” Single Cell Organism

To review, once upon a time, the Evolutionists assure us, a “simple” single-cell life form spontaneously emerged out of a protein-rich “primordial soup”, which, they assure us, also existed. Through the process of binary fission, single bacterial cells divided into multi-cellular organisms. Over billions of years, the family tree branched out to include all living things; from blades of grass, to maggots, to Marilyn Monroe. It’s amazing what a “simple” cell can do!

Charles Darwin had proposed that the very first cell, the universal common ancestor of all life forms, could have formed "in some warm little pond." One of Darwin's supporters, the German biologist *(and proven forger)* Ernst Haeckel, examined a mixture of mud removed from the sea bed and claimed that this was a nonliving substance that turned into a living one. This so-called "mud that comes to life," is an indication of just how simple life was thought to be by the founders of "The Theory of Evolution" *(bow your head in solemn reverence as you say that)*.

By invoking the “simplicity” of that original simple cell, Evolution is made to *sound* somewhat plausible, at least to the easily impressed. The misrepresentation of the original simple cell, slowly “evolving” into more complex cells, and then into actual creatures over time, is the only way that the Evolutionists can even begin to sell their junk-science. So, let’s attack the theory at its very root, "the simple cell".

To make life easier for the Evolutionists, let us grant them a generous 'head-start' by not even asking where the “Primordial Soup” came from, or the Sun, or the amino acids and protein building blocks, or how the Earth and its chemical components all got here. Let’s focus only on the cell. The word **cell** comes from Latin, ce*lla*, meaning "small room", which is essentially what

the cell is. The cell is the basic structural and functional unit of all living organisms. Cells are the smallest form of life that can replicate independently.

Prokaryotic cells, they say, were the earliest and "simplest" forms of bacterial life on Earth, as they have a self-sustaining process built into them. A prokaryotic cell has three regions, each with its own components. On the outside, **flagella** and **pili** project from the cell's surface. These structures are made of proteins that facilitate movement and communication between cells.

Enclosing the cell itself is the **cell envelope** – which consists of a cell wall covering a **plasma membrane** and a further covering layer called a **capsule**. The envelope gives rigidity to the cell and also serves as a protective filter and barrier against exterior forces. It also prevents the cell from expanding and bursting from environmental pressures.

Finally, inside the cell is the **cytoplasm region** that contains the **complex coded genome** *(More on DNA in the next chapter)*. Prokaryotes can also carry extra-chromosomal DNA elements called **plasmids**, which encode antibiotic resistance genes.



The "randomly formed" original "simple single cell" comes with its own genome; living computer chips packed with complex DNA coding which transmits during cell reproduction.

So you see, dear reader, this bacterial “simple cell” which accidentally, randomly, and “unintelligently” popped up out of the “soup” is not so simple, at all. It's actually a multi-functional, multi-component, integrated, well-oiled and *living* machine that cellular biologists can spend an entire lifetime studying. If it were possible to shrink yourself to the size of an atom, and enter the walls of the “simple single cell”, and gaze about this microscopic world-within-a-world like some awestruck tourist, you would marvel at the suddenly visible nanotechnology enveloping you. Only this bit of orchestrated technology actually *lives*, mends itself, protects itself, feeds itself, and, get this, reproduces itself!

Sorry Chuckie D., but **integrated complexity and living nanotechnology** does not spring up without intelligence behind it. Even the atoms, the tiniest particles of matter within the "simple" cell, demonstrate an ordered and integrated complexity of their own. Every atom is composed of a **nucleus** made of **protons** and **neutrons**. The nucleus is surrounded by a cloud of **electrons**. The electrons are bound to the atom by the **electromagnetic force**, and the protons and neutrons in the nucleus are bound to each other by the **nuclear force**. Nothing "simple" about nuclear physics, Chuck.



Neither atoms nor cells are "simple"!

All "simple" life is **complex and integrated**; and cannot come from non-life. Intelligence cannot come from non-intelligence. Consciousness cannot come from non-consciousness. The Darwinists and the Big Bangers need to

go back to the drawing board and ‘check their math’. They won't though, because Godlessness and conceited arrogance walk hand-in-hand.

*The **mathematical** "fingerprints" of an intelligent creative force are everywhere - snowflakes, galactic swirls, insect wings.*



The “simple” single-cell that Darwin claims just randomly popped up in some pond is actually far more complex than the Space Shuttle, AND it repairs and reproduces itself too.

CHAPTER 12

The Fallacy of the “Super Rat”

We have all heard of the "Super Rats" - those "miracles of Evolution” that have "mutated" into indestructible creatures immune to even the deadliest of rat poisons. With breathless enthusiasm the disciples of Darwin hail these creatures as smoking-gun evidence of "Evolution on steroids".

How pathetic that the “Super Rats” phenomenon is the best "evidence" the Evolutionists can muster in support of Darwin's 'simple first cell - to amoeba - to fish - to amphibian - to ape - to man' delusion. Here is a typical example, from the London Telegraph, of the type of sick, twisted tommy-rot that passes for "science", and "journalism" these days:

New 'Super Rats' Evolve Resistance to Poison

Rats across Britain are evolving a resistance to poison that makes them almost impossible to kill, scientists have warned.

"Genetic mutations have produced a new breed of "super rat" with DNA that protects the vermin from standard toxins, according to Professor Robert Smith at the University of Huddersfield." **(1)**

And this from PBS *(Propaganda – B.S. -Sophistry)*:

Pesticide Resistance

"The chemical arsenal we have developed in an attempt to rid our homes of rodents and our crops of insects is losing its power. We have simply caused pest populations to evolve, unintentionally applying artificial selection in the form of pesticides. Individuals with a higher tolerance for our poisons survive and breed, and soon resistant individuals outnumber the ones we can control." **(2)**



"Shhhh! Please don't 'rat' me out as a fraud!"

And on and on the fallacy goes; promoted by the press, taught in the schools, enforced by the state, never questioned and never challenged. The most frustrating feature of this big lie is that it is *so* simple to debunk. All it takes is a bit of thought and some common sense, yet the lie rolls on and on.

Now you might say, *"Wait a minute. The Super Rat phenomenon is very real. The rats without immunity die. Those rats lucky enough to have the immunity survive, and the offspring of those survivors inherit the immunity. What's so hard to understand about that?"*

Well, there is nothing hard to understand about that; and nobody disputes the existence of Super Rats. But the phenomenon only demonstrates natural selection *(or, in this case, artificially-induced natural selection)*. **But the rat remains a rat!** Nothing changed. Nothing "evolved". Nothing "mutated". **Not a single additional line of complex genetic code was added to the overall rat gene pool that wasn't already there to begin with; and no**

new chromosomes either. The surviving rats were already genetically immune to the poison. The dead ones were not. What type of insane "scientist" would make the galactic leap-of-faith from this commonsense example of micro natural selection, all the way to the 'simple first cell - to amoeba - to fish - to amphibian - to ape - to man' scenario?

The bottom line remains: **trans-species evolution - let alone trans-genus, trans-family, trans-order, trans-class, trans-phylum, trans-kingdom - has never been observed; neither in the fossil record, nor in the current natural world**. And anyone who tries to use the 'Super Rats' as a means to circumvent this Darwinian difficulty is either a criminal, an insane person, or just someone who hasn't given the matter much thought. Bottom line: genetic traits *(complex DNA codes)* may be irretrievably lost from the gene pool of a given species; but not gained.

Atheistic Evolutionists have yet to prove a single case of trans-species Evolution, yet, on the basis of 'Super-Rats', we are expected to jump all the way up the biological classification ladder to trans-Kingdom Evolution -

which holds that both the lovely woman above and the inanimate rose that she is smelling have the same great grandmother [x].

"Pond scum become ape? Ha ha ha. Darwin so stupid!"

To better dispel the Super Rat Fallacy, for the sake of those who still don't see through the scam, let make an analogy to biological weapons. The technology for engineering race-specific biological weapons does indeed exist. Let us all hope and pray that the weapons themselves do not exist in some secret laboratory! But suppose that some evil clandestine group were to poison the reservoirs and springs of Japan with a biological weapon that was lethal to people with a certain gene specific to Asiatics. *(that's the analogy to the rat poison)*.

What would happen? Obviously, all of the Asiatic inhabitants of Japan would die after drinking the poisoned water. But what about the tiny minority of White expatriates, tourists, missionaries etc, present in Japan at the time of the great poisoning? The biological weapon wouldn't kill them. The "Whites of Japan" would survive, unchanged, and pass on their genetic immunity to the bio-weapon on to their offspring. *(the analogy to the Super-Rat)*. One hundred years later, Japan could be a thriving island nation of 10 million White people, all speaking English too.

Now, what type of deranged crackpot mad-scientist would then dare to hypothesize, no, *declare*, that the Asiatics of Japan "mutated" into White people? See my point? And yet, this is exactly the type of madness that the

great and the good of Academia are shoving down our throats as they denounce doubters as "uneducated" and "anti-science". Those dirty rats!

In the bio-weapon analogy to 'Super Rats', the predominately Asiatic group on the left "mutates" into the totally White group on the right only because a dash of certain "White genes" are already present among a few of the population (girl on far left). That is NOT 'Evolution'.

CHAPTER 13

The Fallacy of the 98% Chimp-Human DNA Match

There is literally not a single claim regarding Darwinian Evolution dogma that has not been logically and/or scientifically dispelled after closer inspection. Out of necessity, new fallacies have to be concocted to defend the old. It's almost comical to watch the devious dance of the Darwinists. For the reader's enlightenment and entertainment, your host hereby presents and rebuts what is perhaps the most common fallacy of Evolution – the 98% trick. Indeed, a Google Search of just the term "98% DNA" yields 16,400,000 results *(Chapter 3: Repetition Fallacy / Bias).*

.

MYTH:

The 98% similarity between human and chimpanzee DNA is evidence of common descent.

"Scientists figured out decades ago that chimps are our nearest evolutionary cousins, roughly 98% to 99% identical to humans at the genetic level. When it comes to DNA, a human is closer to a chimp than a mouse is to a rat.

Yet tiny differences, sprinkled throughout the genome, have made all the difference. Agriculture, language, art, music, technology and philosophy-all the achievements that make us profoundly different from chimpanzees are somehow encoded within minute fractions of our genetic code."

(1) (Time Magazine, October 1, 2006*)*

ANDREW SULLIVAN ON BLIND FAITH ■ LEO & JACK & MATT & MARTY
TIME
HOW WE BECAME HUMAN
Chimps and humans share almost 99% of their DNA. New discoveries reveal how we can be so alike—and yet so different

How many times have we heard this one? This trick is intended to make us believe that if only just a few of DNA codes - “minute fractions” as TIME put it- had appeared in a different sequence, we would all still be apes. But the 98% similarity is grossly and deliberately misleading because it depends on what is being compared. There are a number of significant differences that are difficult to quantify, and a number of “difficulties” with this claim that no amount of “Perils of Pauline” trick can ever surmount.

1. DIFFERENT NUMBER OF CHROMOSOMES

In the nucleus of each cell, the DNA is tightly packaged into thread-like structures called **chromosomes**. Humans have 23 pairs of chromosomes while chimps have 24. **In order for a species to reproduce, the number of chromosomes must match**. Therefore, in order for Evolution to have worked, a pair of our “missing link” ancestor ape grand parents would had to have birthed a son with one less chromosome *(an event which has **never** been observed in nature!)*; while at the same exact time in history, another pair our “missing link” ancestor ape grand parents would also have given birth to a daughter with one less chromosome. Those two “mutants” would then have to coincidentally met and mate, producing a new species of 23-chromosome ape-humans. This isn’t science. This is fantasy.

2. BILLIONS OF CHANCE-MUTATIONS & CHANCE-ENCOUNTERS

The aforementioned series of impossible events *(again, a single case has never been observed!)* would only represent a tiny fraction of the chance chromosome “mutations”, and chance encounters between the imperceptible “mutants”, dating back to our early days as single-cell pond scum. Consider these variations in chromosome numbers: Our distant insect cousin, the fruit fly, has only 8 chromosomes; but our distant fishy cousin, the gold fish, has 104. That adds up to a *whole lot* of “mutations” and a *whole lot* of chance romantic encounters.

Imagine winning the lottery a million times, or more!

3. DIFFERENT SEQUENCES

While 18 pairs of chimp and human chromosomes are very similar; for chromosomes 4, 9 and 12 the genes and markers are not in the same order in the human and the chimpanzee. Instead of being ‘remodeled’, as the Evolutionists *speculate*, these differences, logically, support separate creation.

4. A DIFFERENCE OF 2% - 5% IS NOT “MINUTE”!

The complex-coded genome is so massive that a 2% difference is HUGE. The 2% DNA difference *(some scientists say it is 5%)* still amounts to ***many millions*** of different base pairs of DNA. That's quite a difference, and it cannot be by chance.

Viva la difference!

5. MUTANTS AND CROSS-SPECIES OFFSPRING DO NOT REPRODUCE

Even when the chromosome count matches and genomes are very similar, everything in nature, both in regard to survival and reproductive capability, seems to work *against* change. For example, a two-headed mutant snake may survive, but it will never produce a new species of double-headed snakes.

A lion and a tiger can produce a liger, a cumbersome beast that is not only incapable of survival in the wild, but cannot breed in captivity as it is sterile.

A zebra and a horse can produce a zorse; again, a sterile creature.

Even in the plant / vegetable Kingdom, hybrids of certain species of fruits produce new but sterile fruits. That's how we get seedless grapes and seedless watermelons. No seeds = no "babies".

It's the end of the "Evolutionary" ride for the Zorse and the seedless watermelon.

CHAPTER 14

DNA: (Darwin Nailed Again!)

Your humble author's Biology "credentials" are about as basic as his Chemistry resume, a "B" in High School. *(But I did 'Ace' every English, History, and Philosophy Class I ever had…just sayin)* It was not until writing this Chapter that I was reminded that "DNA" actually stands for 'Deoxyribonucleic Acid'. We might also refer to DNA as "Darwin Nailed Again", because it truly does hammer the final nail into the coffin of Darwinism.

Don't be intimidated by "Theoretical Biologists" my friends. Just a bit of basic self-study on DNA is enough to downgrade the notion of Darwinian Evolution from the preposterous, to the clinically insane. That's *not* an Appeal to Ridicule because the logical reasons for such an assessment are forthcoming.

DNA FOR SCIENCE DUMMIES

DNA is a molecule that encodes the genetic instructions used for the development and functioning of all living organisms. Just like computer code, written by very smart programmers, instructs a computer to do what it does, DNA code contains complex genetic instructions that determine our physical characteristics.

DNA molecules consist of two organic strands coiled around each other to form a double helix, similar in appearance to a pair of hairs coiled around each other. Each strand is composed of a compound - either guanine (G), adenine (A), thymine (T), or cytosine (C). We shall leave the heavy biology to the science crowd. For our purposes *(Logic & Reason)*, all you need to know is these four letters – G, A, T, and C. Simple!

It is the sequence of these four letters, running along the helix structure that encodes biological information. A gene is a sequence of DNA that contains genetic information and determines the characteristics of an organism. The “Rules of Translation”, are known as ‘The Genetic Code”.

The Genetic Code consists of three-letter 'words' formed from a sequence of three nucleotides *(e.g. ACT, CAG, TTT etc)* As a matter of fact, a group of Harvard researchers once actually encoded an entire book into the genetic molecules of DNA, and then read back the text!

In short, the whole essence of our being can literally be “read” from our genetic codes, in the exact same way that one reads a book or computer code.



DNA-coded coils of mind blowing complexity!

We have 6 feet of DNA crammed into the nucleus of every cell. This is somewhere between 5 and 10 billion miles of DNA in every one of us.

The DNA / Genetic Code is a built-in instruction manual that literally rewrites itself into an organism’s offspring. So, when people say, *“You have*

your mother's smile." What they are really saying is something like: *"You have your mother's ACG, TGA, GCG, AAA sequence of compounds."*

DNA = letters; Genes= words; Genetic Code = Translation, Genome = Book

And that's all you need to know about DNA, for our purposes. Whatever other "dazzling Biology" the Darwinists wish to throw at you amounts to nothing but a smoke screen of intellectual intimidation. (*Fallacy of Verbosity & Complexity / Chapter 3)*

Just how complex are these codes? Well, computer codes consist of combinations of just two digits; 0 and 1. Genetic Codes are based on combinations of four characters; T, G, A and C. If set to paper, our codes would type out enough "pages" to fill up multiple sets of Encyclopedias! Are we to believe this complex language was written, amended and rewritten -*millions of times*- by blind forces? Can an explosion in a print shop yield a perfect copy of the U.S. Constitution; followed by subsequent writing explosions for each of the 10 Amendments *(Bill of Rights)* which then followed?

Computer Programmer and Internet blogger, Sanjay Patel offers this observation:

"I have written a lot of computer code in my time. In my view, it is hard to believe that complex code forms on its own in cell DNA to make complex parts, processes and bio-machines. Now we are being told that the exact same complicated and functional parts are evolving over and over in different organisms.

What they are really saying is that the highly complicated and detailed code for these parts randomly fell together not just once, but millions of times. When has a programmer ever had 100 lines of complicated code written for them because their laptop was hit by a power surge? When has an engineer struggling with a problem looked out their beach-front window to see the equation they need written in the seaweed washed up on their beach?

Complex information of the type we are discussing does not arise from natural forces in the "real world". To assert that long and complex code will form over and over in DNA is nothing short of a ride on the LE, the "Lunatic Express". Just because the cell is too small to see is no reason to start believing that the unimaginable happens within its walls.

I always thought that the first reproducing cell was too complex to form naturally. Now we are told that the exact same complex stuff just "happens" over and over and over. I read people talking about "gaining genes", as if they were gaining simple Lego bricks. A new gene is an incredibly complex line of genetic code with detailed instructions that few humans would know how to dream up for the task. Yet bio bloggers talk of new code, new genes just coming, disappearing, then appearing again. This is the stuff of Harry Potter, not science.

What are the chances that someone else on a blog would write my comment word for word? What are the chances of that happening two or three times, repeating this comment word for word on different blogs? We all know it is NILL! But you want me to believe that DNA code evolves over and over?

Just how much hogwash are people willing to believe these days? Only intelligent creators make code, and repeat it where needed, just like me." **(1)**

Well put! You see folks, thanks to the discoverers of DNA, we now know that even Darwin's single cell "Universal Common Ancestor" was not the "simple" creature which had been imagined after all. It's more like a computer micro-chip. Even single cell amoebas have complex DNA code. For some unknown reason, an amoeba cell actually contains more DNA codes than a single human cell! **(2)**



A transferable computer microchip embedded within all living organisms….including amoebas!

The disciples of Chuckie Darwin now "require" us to believe that the Spontaneous Soviet Soup of Comrades Oparin and Urey blindly wrote a recipe for amino acids, and a separate recipe for making proteins from the amino acids, and a separate recipe for combining the proteins with other essential elements, and finally, an actual book with perfect grammar, no typos, and built in duplication and modification capabilities - all after the Great Rolex Watch that is the Universe was formed by Blind Big Bangs and "coalescing" matter that came from nowhere!

Forget "Theoretical Science". It's going to take a Theoretical *Magician* to put the shattered shell of Humpty Dumpty's Unscientific Atheism back together now. What would St. Darwin have to say about DNA? In all fairness, the existence of DNA was unknown back in his time. Nonetheless, to use Darwin's own words, we can "infer" by "probability" and "analogy" how good old Charlie would handle this devastating objection if he were alive today. Let's pretend.

Enter, from stage-left, Pauline. Take it from here Chuckie *(played by author)*:

"I absolutely, and with total candor, do confess, freely and openly, that the very idea of highly complex and unimaginably lengthy DNA codes perfectly writing and re-writing themselves countless of times, would seem like an opinion worthy of a straight-jacketed inmate in an insane asylum. But at one

time, the belief that the earth was spherical instead of flat must have also seemed crazy. Reason and experience therefore dictates that blind and random DNA re-writes are indeed possible."

Thank you Chuckie, and thank you Pauline. That was a most thrilling and intellectually stimulating Rescue / Red Herring combo.

DNA DENIERS

DNA was first isolated by the Swiss physician Friedrich Miescher who, in 1869, discovered the microscopic substance in the pus of surgical bandages. But it was James Watson (US) and Francis Crick (UK) who originated what is now accepted as the first correct double-helix model of DNA structure, in 1953.

There is no denying the genius of these two giants of 20th Century Biology; and for that, they deserve far more fame and accolades than they have been given. Messrs Crick & Watson; your humble author salutes you!

But in a stunning display of Cognitive Bias, Crick & Watson promote the Genetic Code not as a refutation of Blind Evolution, but rather as *confirmation* of their lifelong and outspoken Atheism.

From the Telegraph (UK) / March 2003

Do our genes reveal the hand of God?

The discoverers of the DNA double helix dismiss the idea of God, but other scientists are not so sure.

"The scientists who launched a revolution with the discovery of the structure of DNA in Cambridge 50 years ago have both used the anniversary to mount

an attack on religion.

When they revealed DNA's double-helix structure in 1953, Francis Crick and James Watson helped to invent biotechnology, provided the foundation for understanding the diversity of life on Earth, revealed the mechanism of inheritance and shed light on diseases such as cancer, and even the origins of antisocial behavior.

From Copernicus to Charles Darwin, scientific discoveries have had a habit of offending religious susceptibilities. Most scientists, even Darwin, tread warily and avoid attacking religion, but Watson and Crick are both outspoken atheists.

Speaking to The Telegraph, Crick, 86, said: "The god hypothesis is rather discredited." ***Indeed, he says his distaste for religion was one of his prime motives in the work that led to the sensational 1953 discovery****.*

"I went into science because of these religious reasons, there's no doubt about that. I asked myself what were the two things that appear inexplicable and are used to support religious beliefs: the difference between living and nonliving things, and the phenomenon of consciousness." **(3)** (emphasis added)

(Confirmation Bias, Cognitive Dissonance & Backfire Effect / Chapter 3)

Frequent and strident critics of the literal Genesis account *(Straw Man Fallacy)*, Atheists Crick & Watson were also prone to using the "Black White Fallacy", and "Appeal to Ridicule" by jousting with Adam & Eve, the talking snake of Eden, Jonah, etc.

It is the contention of Crick & Watson that their discovery is an explanatory validation of Atheism / Unintelligent Design. This bit of illogic can best be understood with a little parable. Let's call it, *'The Parable of the Limo Driver and the Theoretical Mechanics'*.

Setting: *A limo driver is taking two world renowned mechanics to London's Heathrow Airport. Along the way, the chatty driver engages Crick & Watson in a conversation about cars. The two great tinkerers comment on the*

smooth ride and handling of the luxury limo. The conversation proceeds as follows:

Driver: Yes. The man who engineered this vehicle must have been some genius. We really take for granted the miracle that is automobile transportation, eh gentlemen?

Watson: That's nonsense my good man! There is nothing miraculous about this vehicle.

Crick: Indeed. The belief in some magical auto designer is a remnant of past superstitions.

Driver: You mean the car created itself? How so?

Watson: Through Mechanical Evolution. Pull over and we will show you.

The driver pulls over to the shoulder of the road and pops open the hood. Crick and Watson pull out their tool kits and effortlessly dismantle the engine parts as they masterfully explain the functions and interconnectedness of each component. Shocked by the light of discovery, the awestruck driver looks on in amazement as the two Mechanical wizards then reassemble the various parts with the same degree of ease which they had removed them."

Crick: So you see my servant; there is a rational explanation for everything. Only weak minded fools still cling to the belief in intelligent auto engineering.

Watson: That's right Crick. Dear driver; do see how everything works now?

Driver: I see! I see! You guys are absolutely brilliant!

Crick & Watson: *(in unison)* We know!

Driver: I would never have figured out the functions of all those parts on my own. All I know how to do is drive the thing and put gas in the tank. That's how dumb I am.

Crick: That's why you're just a lowly driver and we're world renowned mechanics.

Driver: That's for sure. But I just have a few more questions; may I?

Watson: Certainly. We are here to teach.

Driver: Where did all of those parts come from? How did they all assemble themselves? And who screwed, bolted and welded them all together like that?

Crick: Just shut up and drive you ignorant religious fanatic!

The two giants of DNA research remained stubborn, hard core Atheists.

The unsound thinking of Crick & Watson was summed up by the pre-eminent brain surgeon, Dr. Benjamin Carson of Johns Hopkins University:

"One of the most damning pieces of evidence against Evolution is the human genome. You can see that you have a very complex sophisticated coding mechanism, 4 different amino acids, and various sequences that give you millions of different genetic instructions. It's very much like computer programming which uses a series of 0 and 1's in different sequences but it gives you very specific information about what that computer is to do. Well this at least twice as complex because we have 4 digits instead of 2 digits." **(4)**



Of course, “it doesn’t take a brain surgeon” to figure that out. Nonetheless, it’s good to have Dr. Carson on our team!

CHAPTER 15

Darwinian Evolution Fails the Scientific Method

Next to the personal ad hominem attack; the tiresome, condescending and in-your-face mantra of *"science – science – science"* is the Evolutionist's most commonly used psychological weapon. The implication is that unless one holds an advanced science degree, he is disqualified from forming an independent opinion. This rhetorical device is a weaponized trick that we shall now disarm.

First of all, the lack of any extensive "scientific background" does not necessarily disqualify a logical thinker from questioning Evolution or any other matter related to science. If a man observes a rapidly darkening sky on a brutally hot and humid summer afternoon; followed by a sudden temperature drop and distant rumbles of thunder; would his lack of a "background in meteorology" invalidate his opinion that rain is forthcoming?

If a man opts to take the elevator downstairs instead of simply jumping out of a 40th floor window and into his waiting open convertible; would his lack of a "background in physics" invalidate his fear of jumping out of skyscrapers?

It doesn't take a scientist to discern the obvious.

This idea that any matters pertaining to science, or *alleging* to pertain to science, can only be discussed by those with the right "qualifications" is a clear example of another classic logical fallacy; the 'Appeal to Authority'. Every great philosopher from Buddha, to Confucius, to Plato, to Socrates, to Marcus Aurelius, to Jesus, to Schopenhauer and so many others specifically warned against the inherent errors associated with this type of boot-licking, group-thinking worship of authority figures. Again, repeating what Buddha expressed in a previous chapter, and this cannot be emphasized or repeated enough:

"Do not go by reports, by legends, by traditions, by scripture, by logical conjecture, by inference, by analogies, by agreement through pondering views, by probability, or by the thought." **(1)**

In other words, *"Don't assume things; and to hell with those diploma-decorated fools who think they know it all. Use your own reason and observation!"* And with that, let us dispense with this puffed-up patronizing rubbish about "lack of a scientific background" once and for all. You see, it doesn't take a "scientific background" to understand the basic and timeless principles of what is known as **"The Scientific Method"**. Ironically, it is the

hallowed Scientific Method which dooms the "theoretical science" of Darwinian Evolution to the toilet bowl of pseudo-scientific error.

Had Darwin studied Greek or Buddhist philosophy, he would never have made such a monkey of himself.

What is the Scientific Method?

The Scientific Method consists of the flow-chart steps shown in the following chart:

Each step must logically flow into the next step until the process is complete. **No skipping steps!** As soon as the standards of any given step cannot be met, the game ends and the hypothesis must either go into the garbage, or be placed on the shelf until further data is obtained. Now, let's plug "Evolution" into the assembly line and see what we get.

Step 1: Ask a Question

OK. This one is easy. Anyone can ask a question about anything. Here it goes: **"How did we all get here?"**

Step 2: Do Background Research


The Scientific Method
Ask a question
Do background research
Construct a hypothesis
Test your hypothesis by doing an experiment
Analyze your data and draw a conclusion
Report your results. Was your hypothesis correct?

Gather data and observe it carefully. If you detect a pattern that *suggests* a plausible conclusion, then move onto the next step. What Darwin "discovered" during this step is that all living creatures share many common traits; and that the differences among them adapt them perfectly to their natural environment?

Step 3: Construct a Hypothesis

Based on your data mining, make an ***educated*** guess as to what the truth is. Not just any ole guess; not a wild and baseless guess; but an ***educated*** guess based on a compelling pattern of data. Here, at a very early stage of the Scientific Method, Darwin has already gone off the rails. In his own weasel words:

*"The real affinities of all organic beings, in contradiction to their adaptive resemblances, are due to inheritance or community of descent. Therefore I should **infer** from **analogy** that **probably** all the organic beings which have ever lived on this earth have descended from some one primordial form, into which life was first breathed."* **(2)**

What Darwin observed is really nothing that a retarded 8 year old, living in a cave 10,000 years ago, could not have easily noticed on his own; namely, that all creatures have many traits in common. For example, a lizard has two eyes, a mouth, teeth, a tongue, four limbs, a spine, a skeleton etc; and, a human being also has two eyes, a mouth, teeth, a tongue, four limbs, a spine, a skeleton etc. And from that, and **nothing more**, Darwin "hypothesizes" that all living things came from an original "single-cell" organism? Really Chuck?

Aha!!! Lovely Cindy Crawford and the lizard both have brown eyes and two nostrils! Therefore let us hypothesize that they both had the same great-great-great grandma [x].

Darwin himself even admits that there is no data to support his hypothesis; which means that the hypothesis itself should never have been put forth in the first place. Again, as previously stated, from his own mouth:

"On this doctrine of the extermination of an infinitude of connecting links, between the living and extinct inhabitants of the world, and at each successive period between the extinct and still older species, why is not every geological formation charged with such links? Why does not every collection of fossil remains afford plain evidence of the gradation and mutation of the forms of life?

***We meet with no such evidence**. And this is the most obvious and forcible of the many objections used against my theory."* **(3)** (emphasis added)

That's right Chuckie. The **MILLIONS** of "missing links' flowing from single-cell pond scum to modern man and every other living organism did not exist in the late 1800's, nor have they been pieced together to this day. **In fact, as even prominent Evolutionists openly admit, the fossil record actually appears to show that new life forms came on to the scene very suddenly**. *(which supports the Intelligent Design Hypothesis)*

Nonetheless, in spite of the fact that the standards of the 'Hypothesis Step' of the Scientific Method have, by Darwin's own admission, not been met; let us, purely for the sake of argument, cheat a little and give the Evolutionists a "free pass" to the next step.

Step 4: Test Your Hypothesis by Doing an Experiment

I don't know where to even begin with this one. How does one construct an experiment to "prove" that great-great-great grandma[x] was a piece of algae that spontaneously appeared in a pond, and "mutated" into millions of transitional species, culminating in what we are today? In the absence of any experimentation, one could conceivably skip this step and jump to an intense observation of unfolding natural processes; a "natural experiment", so to speak.

But here again, there is nothing to observe. The reality is that trans-species evolution is not observable and has never been observed, neither in nature, nor in the fossil record, nor in a lab experiment. Sorry Evolutionists, but a non-definitive skull fragment of some creature purported to be an "ape ancestor" **does not** meet the standard of scientific observation; let alone constitute hard evidence that great-great-great grandma[x] was a microscopic piece of single-celled pond scum. The same goes for your desperately hyped-up Galapagos finches, peppered moths, 'super rats', platypuses etc.

And speaking of "simple" single-cell organisms *(which we now know are more complex than nuclear submarines and space shuttles!)*, a single-cell organism has NEVER been observed to "mutate" into a new species of two-cell organism. My God! The Evolutionists cannot even validate, neither in nature nor in a laboratory, the jump from one-cell bacteria to a viable two-cell bacteria; yet they call us "stupid" for doubting that our one-celled pond scum great-great-great grandma[x] "evolved" into the modern day human, elephant, bird, bumble bee, dolphin, eagle, spider, flower, tree, flower, octopus etc.



*The "randomly formed" original "simple single cell" comes with its own genome - living computer chips packed with complex DNA coding that transmit during cell reproduction. Nothing like it has ever been **observed** to spontaneously appear and reproduce itself in a pond or in the "primordial soup" that no one has ever seen.*

Obviously, steps 5 and 6 of the Scientific Method are rendered mute; but that doesn't stop the dogmatic Evolutionists and degenerate Marxists from pounding their fists on the table and screaming *"Science ... science ... science!"* in your face; whilst viciously denouncing you as "uneducated" for daring to question their utterly unobservable pond scum to human scenario.

The Theory of trans-species Evolution is **neither testable nor observable**. Likewise, the theory of life blindly coming from non-life is **neither testable, nor observable**; to say nothing of even being sane. Heck, these ideas were never even 'hypothesizable', and that was *before* our understanding of the incredibly complex DNA computer code we call, the genome; **a mind boggling instructional code that is programmed into all organisms**, including those "simple" single-cell amoebas and bacteria!

Bottom Line: According to any honest rendering of the hallowed Scientific Method, Atheistic Evolution is **NOT** science. Indeed, it's not even good science-fiction.

In short, there is nothing behind “Door # 1”!

According to reason, logic, common sense and the Scientific Method; the door marked ‘Atheistic Evolution’ leads nowhere.

CHAPTER 16

The Folly of Theistic Evolution

Let us again list the three, *and only three*, options available to the logical mind.

1: AE: Atheistic Evolution

2: TE: Theistic Evolution

3: ID: Intelligent Design

If at this point, the reader's belief in random and blind Big Bang –Big Blend –Big Soup - with self-composing amino acids, self-composing proteins, self composing and self-amending volumes of DNA code written within the microscopic walls of self-composing and self-replicating single cells – still remains unshaken; then there is little else to be said.

Let us part now and agree to disagree. Just leave our kids alone, OK? Good bye, and give my regards to the Tooth Fairy, the Easter Bunny and Bigfoot too.

For the rest of the class, that leaves two options still remaining on the table of deduction. Let's have a look at what's behind 'Door # 2", Theistic Evolution.

Like the Atheist, the Theistic Evolutionist, for the most part, also believes in Big Bang –Big Blend –Big Soup; with self-composing amino acids, self-composing proteins, self-composing and self-amending volumes of DNA code written within the microscopic walls of self-composing and self-replicating single cells. The only difference is that the TE claims that the process was not blind. God intelligently guided the Bang, the Blend, and the

Soup etc. With this position, the TE is able to “reconcile Science with Religion.” The most well-known proponent of Theistic Evolution is Francis Collins, former head of the Human Genome Project and current Director of the National Institute of Health.

As a logical hypothesis, once the possibility of AE has been eliminated, the notion that a Being of Supreme Intelligence and creative power used Theistic Evolution as his creation mechanism is a plausible assertion. After all, He is the “Big G”. His Universe; His rules.

The problem with TE is that when we look for **evidence** of intelligently guided Darwinian Evolution serving as God’s “secret recipe”, we run into the same “difficulties” that Charlatan Darwin told us *“we have no right to”* worry about. The same “inferences”, the same “analogies”, the same “imperfect geological record”, the same lack of observation, and the same crutch-like reliance upon Theoretical Science that all serve to render Darwinism a futile fantasy, doom TE as well. The Marilyn & the Maggot scenario is just as baseless under TE as it is under AE.

To better understand the *subconscious* motivations of the TE, a review of Aesop’s Fable of ‘***The Birds & Beasts***’ is in order:

“A great conflict was about to come off between the Birds and the Beasts. When the two armies were collected together the Bat hesitated which to join.

The Birds that passed his perch said: “Come with us”; but he said: “I am a Beast.” Later on, some Beasts who were passing underneath him looked up and said: “Come with us”; but he said: “I am a Bird.”

At the last moment peace was made, and no battle took place, so the Bat came to the Birds and wished to join in the rejoicings, but they all turned against him and he had to fly away. He then went to the Beasts, but soon had to beat a retreat, or else they would have torn him to pieces. "Ah," said the Bat, "I see now,

***Lesson: He that is neither one thing nor the other has no friends*. (1)**

What a "moderate" is to Politics, the TE is to Science. They find the "middle ground" from which they may seek refuge from the two "extremes". The TE does not want to be shunned and called "uneducated" by the scientific crowd. Nor does he wish to be shunned and called "Godless" by the believers. His subconscious mind seeks to relieve the discomfort of associating with either "extreme". He thus falls into "The Truth Always Lies Somewhere in the Middle" Fallacy *(Chapter 3)*

To the AE crowd, the TE can say, *"I accept Darwinian Evolution 100%. Please, please don't confuse me with those ignorant uneducated Bible thumpers."* To the ID crowd, the TE can say, *"I believe in God 100%. Please, please don't confuse me with those arrogant Godless Atheists."*

In the end, the TE has no ideological friends and no logical case either. Collins' TE did not insulate him one bit from the ridicule which the Atheists directed at his 2009 nomination to head up the NIH. But it may have saved him from having to withdraw his name from consideration altogether.

With all due respect to the brilliant Dr. Collins, Theistic Evolution is based on psychological insecurity and the need for acceptance; not science. And no man, regardless of education, intellect and training, can ever be 100% immune to the quirks of human psychology.

This one is easy. Option 2 belongs in the same trash heap as Option 1.

Two options eliminated. What's behind Door #3?

CHAPTER 17

Karl Loves Chuckie

In light of what we have learned in preceding chapters, a reasonable man must by now be wondering how the Great Fairy Tale could possibly have become so enthroned, so entrenched, and so widely accepted by otherwise intelligent people who ought to have known better. If science and Reason were not the forces that propelled Unscientific Evolutionary Atheism to such unassailable heights, then what did?

There were two essential factors that contributed to Evolution's "fast start", meteoric rise, and continuing supremacy:

1. Growing 19th Century Skepticism Concerning Biblical Literalism
2. The Powerful International Force of Marxist-"Progressive"-Liberal Politics

By the time that Darwin had set pen to paper, many among the European and American Intelligentsia were having their doubts about the literal accounts of the Book of Genesis.

They weren't necessarily Atheists. But many were thirsty for an alternative explanation of Creation. These reasonable doubts had thus pre-disposed the

Intellectual Class to accepting a different explanation for the mystery of life. The soil of many educated minds had already been loosened and fertilized *before* Darwin even published *Origin of Species*.

The 2nd *(and most significant)* element of Darwin's instant success has to do with politics. Even more so than money, politics can be the most corruptive force created by man. **As with any other historical myth, it was the power of politicized force that exalted and sustained Evolution**. And make no mistake; the rise of Darwinian Evolution has always been steeped in the corruptive culture of politics; of the Leftish type.

Recall that Soviet Comrade Oparin *(under Stalin's supervision)* gave us the "Primordial Soup". Communist lover Urey gave us a rigged amino acid experiment. The pro-Communist ACLU brought us the circus of the Scopes Monkey Trial. Marxist Hollywood brought us one ridiculous Straw Man version of *Inherit the Wind* after another after another. Son of a Communist Gould brought us "Punctuated Equilibrium". The pattern is unmistakable. The question is: *why?*

The ink in Darwin's 1859 Origin of Species was barely dry before the two man-gods of the logically flawed ideology of Communism, Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx, began promoting Darwin's work. Engels had actually acquired one of the first 1200 copies of Darwin's clap-trap. Follow this sequence of events.

November 24, 1859: Darwin publishes Origin of Species

November 27-30, 1859: Engels acquires of the very first copies and sends a letter to Marx telling him: **(1)**

"*Darwin, by the way, whom I'm just reading now, is absolutely splendid*". **(2)**

December 19, 1860: Marx writes a letter to Engels telling him that Darwin's book provides the natural-history foundation for the Communist viewpoint:

"These last four weeks, I have read all sorts of things. Among others, Darwin's book ….this is the book which contains the basis on natural history ***for our view***. **(3)** (emphasis added)

January 16, 1861: Marx writes an excited letter to his Communist friend Ferdinand Lassalle, the founder of the International Socialist movement in Germany:

"Darwin's work is most important and ***suits my purpose*** *in that it provides a basis in natural science for the historical class struggle."* **(4)** (emphasis added)

June 18, 1862: Marx had already *re-read Origin of Species*, and again writes to Engels: *"I am amused at Darwin, into whom I looked again"* **(5)**

1862: Marx quotes Darwin again within his Theories of Surplus Value:

"*In his splendid work, Darwin did not realize that by discovering the 'geometrical progression' in the animal and plant kingdom, he overthrew the Malthus theory*." **(6)**

German Communist leader Wilhelm Liebknecht later described just how excited the 19th Century Communist leaders all were about the new theory:

"*When Darwin drew the conclusions from his research work and brought them to the knowledge of the public,* ***we spoke of nothing else for months but Darwin*** *and the enormous significance of his scientific discoveries*." **(7)** (emphasis added)



Engels, Marx, and Liebknecht. The Big 3 legends of 19th Century Communist subversion were all obsessed with Darwinism. Why?

Historian Richard Weikart revealed that Marx had started to attend "*a series of lectures by Thomas Henry Huxley on evolution.*" Huxley, and many in his family, were afflicted with severe, generational mental health problems. This may, or may not account for Huxley's odd obsession with passionately promoting a theory that had no observable evidence behind it, *at all*. For his fanatical promotion of Evolution, the blustering biologist became known as "Darwin's Bulldog" **(8)**



Huxley: Darwin's Bulldog

Why would a scientific truth need a "bulldog" to promote and defend it anyway? As the Philosopher St. Augustine once observed, "*The truth is like a lion; you don't have to defend it. Let it loose; it will defend itself.'* **(9)**

After a century and a half of searching for millions of magical missing links, Darwinism still requires a whole pack of "bulldogs" to defend it.

In the 2nd Edition of Das Kapital, Marx included two explicit references to Darwin and evolution in which he related Darwin's theory to his own opinion about production and technology development. Marx referred to *Origin of Species* as "*epoch-making work*", and went on to compare Darwin's view of organs to his own bizarre view of tools and manufacturing. Marx made the bizarre argument that historical forces had chosen Communism in a form of evolutionary development.

In a book review of *Das Kapital*, Engels wrote that Marx was:

"…striving to establish the same gradual process of transformation demonstrated by Darwin in natural history as a law in the social field." **(10)**

June 16, 1873: Marx sends Darwin an autographed copy of *Das Kapital*, with the words:

Mr. Charles Darwin, On the part of his sincere admirer - Karl Marx. **(11)**

October, 1873: Darwin writes back to Marx, thanking him for having sent his work:

"*I believe that we both earnestly desire the extension of knowledge*. **(12)**

Marx's admiration for Darwin's work had little to do with Science. The Communists believed that Darwin provided a perspective that suited the goals of Atheistic Communism. And what exactly were, and still are, the goals of Marxism, and its little brother, "Liberalism / Progressivism"?

Many people remain under the mistaken impression that Marxism represents a legitimate political-economic theory. It is not. Behind it's empty promise of a "workers' paradise" and "social justice", Marx's *Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital* are just intellectual masks for a global scheme of intense government centralization. Marxism specifically calls for heavy income taxes, a Central Bank with a monopoly on credit, abolition of private land ownership and inheritance, state control of communication, education, agriculture, transportation, manufacturing, medicine, and abolition of religion. Marx refers to this totalitarian scheme as "*the dictatorship of the proletariat*".

It is important to note that Marx himself was merely an artificially puffed up "front man" for much bigger movers and shakers, "behind the scenes". It's a fascinating tale, but one for another time.

Marx's cult followers *(Reds)* promoted violence, class envy, and hostility towards free markets, family, business, tradition, Christianity and religion. In addition to the angry misfits and maladjusted criminals who still worship Marx, there are many well-meaning idealists who fall, hook, line and sinker for his poisonous promises of a better world with "equality" and prosperity for all. Communist icon Vladimir Lenin would later refer to these types as "useful idiots". We know them to this day as "liberals" or "progressives". In

years to come, these naïve and unthinking idealists will help the Reds greatly.

The influence of Marxism, combined with the rapid spread of liberalism / progressivism, will grow throughout the second half of the 1800's, and blossom during the 1900's. After the first successful Marxist revolution in 1918, the Russian Tsar and his beautiful family were brutally murdered. Soon afterwards, Winston Churchill described International Communism as follows:

"This worldwide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognizable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution.

It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the 19th Century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire." **(13)**

Famed writer, historian, philosopher and Soviet dissident Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn described the Bolshevik years:

"More of my countrymen suffered horrific crimes at their blood-stained hands than any people or nation ever suffered in the entirety of human history. ***It cannot be overstated. Bolshevism committed the greatest human slaughter of all time"*** **(14)** (emphasis added)

When Bolshevik-Communists like Lenin & Stalin took over Russia, the Tsar and his family were herded into a basement; then shot and bayoneted to death. Mass terror and oppression followed. On the right, see the grand Christ the Savior Cathedral of Moscow being demolished in 1931.

Over the next 30 years, the Atheist Bolshevik-Communists of the new Soviet Union then proceeded to murder as many as 50 million Russian Christians. That's the kind of stuff that happens when men replace God.

Now, listen up, for this is critical. **The Marxist / Liberal hostility towards Christianity has nothing to do with their disbelief in the creation account of the Book of Genesis**. The reason why the Left is so often hostile towards Christianity, and religion in general, is because religion equips its followers with an internal sense of right and wrong. Good behavior among individuals and groups leads to civil societies. Moral and virtuous people can take care of themselves, their families, and even the less fortunate among their community, *without* the need for an all powerful governmental "welfare state".

On the other hand, a degenerate and dependent "proletariat" can not only be easily controlled, but can also be used to rise up and overthrow the targeted ruling class *(of which the Church was part of)*. Once the "Capitalists" and clerics are displaced and murdered, all that lofty talk about "workers' paradise" goes out the window! Have a look at George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and you will understand.

The observation that morality presents an obstacle to tyranny was best articulated by Samuel Adams, one of America's most influential 'Founding Fathers":

*"**It is in the Interest of Tyrants to reduce the People to Ignorance and vice**. The Religion and public Liberty of a People are intimately connected; their Interests are interwoven, they cannot subsist separately; and therefore they rise and fall together. For this Reason, it is always observable, **that those who are combined to destroy the People's liberties practice every Art to poison their Morals."*** **(15)** (emphasis added)

In his historic Farewell Address to Congress and the country, George Washington said:

*"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these **great pillars of human happiness**, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens.*

*The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked: **Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?*** (emphasis added)

And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." **(16)**

What a difference between the philosophy of America's wise and virtuous founders and the malevolent nonsense of the amoral Marx and Engels!



Unlike Marxism / "progressivism", America's Founders emphasized the connection between God-centered morality and liberty.

Essayist Brandon Smith adds this observation about the revolutionary Marxist need to remove the public internal morality compass:

"The problem is humanity is not only hard-wired with a dark side; we are also hardwired with a conscience — at least, most of us are. All people are born with a shared moral compass that is often expressed in various religious works throughout the ages. It is a universal voice, or guide, that we can choose to listen to or to ignore. Organized psychopaths have struggled with the existence of this inborn compass for centuries." **(17)**

You see, our consciences pose a threat to the corrupt forces which seek to rule humanity as if it were a Global ant colony. It is not enough for the PRC *(Predatory Ruling Class)* to essentially enslave humanity. The PRC must also corrupt the people, especially children. **A morally 'illiterate' populace will never even recognize the evil of tyranny, let alone rise up against their 'control-freak' masters**. They are too busy chasing dollars, buying stuff they don't need, getting drunk, watching TV trash, worshipping sports heroes, and having cheap, loveless sex. Throw these "proles" a few anti-depressants now and then and they'll not rebel against their beloved PRC. This theme was brilliantly prophesied in George Orwell's *1984* as well as Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*.

What better way for the Reds & Liberals to "poison morals" than to tear down the religion which instills them? And what better way to tear down

religion than to replace the God of Intelligent Creation with the god of Dummy Darwinism?

The power players behind the International Left, whether they hide behind the label of Communism, Democratic Socialism, Liberalism, Feminism, Progressivism, Globalism etc., care as much about how life originated on Earth as they do about "the workers" or "the poor" or "the environment" or "human rights". Religion, and the very concept of an Intelligent Designer Himself, stand in the way of their power grabbing scheme to debase humanity and turn us all into worker bee tax & debt slaves.

For that reason, God had to be "killed off".

Had the Christian Church of the 19th Century announced that it was abandoning the Bible altogether and only keeping its moral teachings and charity programs instead, the Left would still have hated the Church!

Of course, not all liberals / progressives are Atheists. Some are even very religious. What we must concern ourselves with is what the "big boys" funding and controlling the Left are up to. It is from this "*worldwide conspiracy*" – this New World Order - that Churchill warned us about that most of the engineered problems of modern humanity emanate *.

* **Churchill himself would later compromise with, and sell out to, this "*worldwide conspiracy*". But that's another sad story**.

So now you know why the all mighty Left promotes Atheism, moral depravity and degeneracy the way it does *(have you watched TV lately?)* Marx was absolutely correct when he wrote that *"Darwin's work suits my purpose."*

THE HARE AND THE TORTOISE

To put it in terms of one of Aesop's fables, the Marxist – Liberal power boosting of Darwinism gave the theory a hare-like head start that carried over into the 20th century and is still running. But eventually, the tortoise of truth will catch up, and win the race. It always does.

CHAPTER 18

The Intelligent Idiot

My departed Mother-In-Law wasn't exactly the most learned woman in the world. But what she lacked in refined education, she more than made up for in instinctive, intuitive intelligence. My favorite of her folksy proverbs was, ***"Some people are so smart they're stupid."***

Your humble author has capably demonstrated how even some of the most brilliant men in their respective scientific fields are capable of some of the most astonishing psychological follies outside of a lunatic asylum. What accounts for this paradox?

The most obvious answer to the paradox of Intelligent Idiots is that Universities, and even High Schools, have become infested with Atheistic liberals and Marxists who mis-educate their students. Though certainly true, the psychological roots of such severe cases of Logical Fallacy and Cognitive Bias run much deeper than the superficial intellectual causes.

Let us retrace the progression from child to man for a typical Intelligent Idiot. Let us use mathematician and Theoretical Cosmologist St. Stephen Hawking; the media acclaimed *"smartest man in the world"*, as a more or less accurate, say, "theoretical" case study.

During little Stephen's formative years in England, his educated parents *(Dad was trained in Medicine / Mom was an Economist)* praised the little boy for parroting back his ABC's and 123's. At an early age, little Stephen's delicate mind was already being conditioned to equate obedient academic regurgitation with praise, love, and self worth.

By the age of eight, the bright little learner was already enrolled in the exclusive St. Albans School. One can easily imagine teachers and his proud

parents enthusiastically showering the impressionable little boy with ego-boosting praise. **The inflation of the intelligent child's ego, and the reflexive association of academic regurgitation with rewards**, *(including parental love!)* were taking root in the undeveloped psyche of precocious little Stephen Hawking.



With subjects such as reading, writing, and math, the system of obedient regurgitation and praise is a necessary and effective model of teaching. That's because the '3 R's' are what they are. They cannot be distorted. Stephen's sharp memory serves him well in this regard.

But with subjects such as History, Philosophy, Economics, Current Events, **Theoretical Science**, the regurgitation / reward model leaves young Stephen vulnerable to manipulation and erroneous information.

The ego gratification associated with the regurgitation & praise model of education was reinforced throughout Stephen's Middle and High School careers. During this time the, 'gifted & talented' Stephen may have been separated out from his 'inferiors' and placed in high level classes; another big boost to the young ego.

Surely, teen age Hawking was taught to recite the illogical ranting of his fellow countrymen from a century earlier, Charles Darwin. At 17, the young mathematician began his studies at Oxford University, perhaps the most "prestigious" University in the world. Now the young boy truly knew that he was smart; *really smart!*



At Oxford, young Stephen continued to regurgitate the complex material of challenging subjects such as physics, mathematics, biology, astronomy, calculus etc. *However*, Stephen was also taught to obediently regurgitate the Atheistic rubbish that permeates the great Universities of the Western world. Because the immature teenager has never had cause to question the undeniable veracity of the Classical Math and Science content presented to him, why would he question what any other textbook or Professor tells him?

By now, young Mr. Hawking has been so psychologically conditioned that he is incapable of distinguishing between the *fact based* regurgitation of the Classical Sciences, and the logically flawed assumptions that support Theoretical Science. His ego is *literally* addicted to the praise/good grades of whatever godlike Professor is instructing him. The hard earned *(and expensive!)* diploma represented the ultimate doggie treat and confirmation, in his mind, that he knew it all.

Never having learned the most important life lesson of all – humility - Hawking proceeded through life as an arrested development case. No one could teach him anything. After all, he graduated from Oxford!

When you challenge someone like Hawking on his belief system, the Great One's entire self worth is suddenly threatened. Telling him for example that Big Bang and the Big Blend are the stuff of science fiction is the equivalent, in his reactive mind, of saying that 2 + 2 is 5!

Because his bloated ego cannot bear the discomfort of being out-of-sync with the intellectual “in crowd', egomaniacs like Hawking will come to despise anyone who so much as questions the validity of his “Theoretical Physics”. This “mad scientist” syndrome is a true mental disorder, and it runs very deep!

Obama, another “genius’ honors the "smartest man alive" with a Medal of Freedom"

In spite of his mathematical prowess, an ‘Intelligent Idiot’ such as Hawking is merely an advanced Pavlovian show dog. Through years of studious regurgitation and positive reinforcement, Hawking may have learned to craft “dazzling” math equations, **but he has never been taught the lesson of humility!**

He knows not how to philosophize – to self examine and self correct his own thoughts and inner psychology – to understand the world - to understand the inner nature of man - to *be* his own man. And his tragic 'hard wired' arrogance *(insecurity)* will prevent him from ever even trying to.

CHAPTER 19

The Paradox of Intolerant Tolerance

All political systems have their lexicon of euphemisms, “buzzwords” that are used to distort meanings and manipulate perceptions. For the Left *(Communists / Progressives)*, one of the most commonly used words is the self-serving plea for “tolerance”. What the Left really means by “tolerance”, is that everyone else must accept, or least consider, whatever lunacy that the Left wants to promote.

As the logically flawed argument of the Left goes; regardless of our own personal opinion we must all be:

“tolerant”; of men “marrying” men and adopting children *(otherwise you are ‘homophobic’)*.

“tolerant”; of millions of illegal immigrants flooding into the country *(otherwise you are ‘xenophobic’)*.

“tolerant”; of the manifest incompetence and radicalism of President Barack Obama *(otherwise you are ‘racist’)*.

“tolerant”; of people who mutilate their own genitals and dress like the opposite sex *(otherwise you are a ‘transphobic’)*.

The list of tolerance demands is endless. So “open minded” these liberal nonbelievers are. Another liberal euphemism is “academic freedom”; by which Leftist professors get to teach pure unaltered Marxism to their captive college students. Anything and everything under the Sun goes, *except* for the teaching and dissemination of any ideas which contradict the “progressive” world view.

That must *never* be “tolerated”!

Ironically, it was that puffed up super hero of Theoretical Science, the Agnostic St. Albert Einstein who said:

"The bigotry of the non-believer is for me nearly as funny as the bigotry of the believer." **(1)**

SHOVES HER BELIEFS DOWN YOUR THROAT
CALLS YOU INTOLERANT
I'M A TOLERANT LIBERAL!
AGREE WITH ME OR ELSE YOU RACIST, SEXIST, HOMOPHOBIC, ISLAMOPHOBIC, XENOPHOBIC, INBRED, REDNECK, BIBLE THUMPING, NASCAR LOVING, GUN TOTING, AMERICA LOVING BIGOTS!

Nowhere is this hypocritical intolerance more evident than when the topic turns to Evolution. In an ironic reversal of the Butler Act which led to the Scopes Monkey Trial, there is scarcely a School Board in America today that can allow any opinion which challenges Darwinian supremacy to enter its classrooms. A school which allows a critical view of St. Darwin will find itself in the legal cross-hairs of the ACLU, the very same gang that staged the Scopes Trial, which was supposed to be about "academic freedom".

KITZMILLER vs DOVER SCHOOL BOARD

In 2005, the ACLU litigated a Pennsylvania case which forced Dover Area School Board to remove any references to even the *possibility* of Intelligent Design. In ruling in favor of the book-banning Atheists, the Judge decreed

that Intelligent Design was not a valid theory and any mention of it violates the Constitution.

The decision struck down a policy that required High School science teachers to present Intelligent Design as only a *possible* alternative to evolution. The "tolerant" Judge Jones ruled:



"The breathtaking inanity of the Board's decision is evident when considered against the factual backdrop which has now been fully revealed through this trial. The students, parents, and teachers of the Dover Area School District deserve better than to be dragged into this legal maelstrom, with its resulting utter waste of monetary and personal resources." **(2)**

Your Dishonor, what exactly is so "breathtakingly inane" about simply questioning the premise of the Big Bang, Big Blend, Soviet Soup, self-forming DNA, and Marilyn & the Maggot with an "imperfect geological record" to support it?

And in regard to your complaint about "*students, parents, and teachers*" being "*dragged into this legal maelstrom*", I would remind you Sir that it was the *Atheists* who initiated the frivolous and expensive legal case, not the Board. Idiot!

EMORY UNIVERSITY ATHEISTS PROTEST DR. BEN CARSON

In 2012, the aforementioned Dr. Benjamin Carson got a taste of that good ole "tolerance". Carson had been invited to deliver the commencement address at Emory University. Prior to the speech, nearly 500 professors, student and alumni signed a "letter of concern", expressing dismay over Carson's rejection of Darwinian Evolution. The letter itself was full of the same old tired Logical Fallacies and Cognitive Biases we have reviewed in Chapter 3**. (*Author's comments in bold parenthesis):***

"Dr. Carson argues that there is no evidence for evolution, that there are no transitional fossils that provide evidence for the evolution of humans from a common ancestor with other apes ***(not just apes - also maggots, trees, ants etc)***

….that evolution is a wholly random process, and that life is too complex to have originated by the natural process of evolution. ***(Yes. DNA code is too complex to randomly pop up)***

….All of these claims are incorrect. ***(Says who?/Case Closed Trick)***

….The evidence for evolution is overwhelming: ***(Evidence is Overwhelming Trick)***

…ape-human transitional fossils are discovered at an ever increasing rate, ***(extinct ape species, at best. What about amoeba to man? Marilyn & the Maggot? Got any proof of that?)***

….and the processes by which organisms evolve new and more complex body plans are now known to be caused by relatively simple alterations of the expression of small numbers of developmental genes ***(only "now known" through the magic of 'Theoretical Biology')***

…..The theory of Evolution is as strongly supported as the theory of gravity. ***(Case Closed Fallacy / The Theory of Gravity does not require 'Theoretical Physics' to prove itself. Go jump off of your Ivory Tower and see what I mean)***.

……Dismissing evolution disregards the importance of science and critical thinking to society. ***(Red Herring, Ad hominem)*** **(3)** (emphasis added)

EVOLUTION DOUBTERS CAN NO LONGER BE PRESIDENT?

During a 2008 nationally televised Republican Presidential debate, the moderator asked candidate John McCain a question never asked before in a Presidential debate:

Moderator: *"Do you believe in Evolution?"*

Clearly rattled by the inquisitor, McCain answered with a nervous smile and one word.

McCain: *"Yes"*

The inquisitor then continued:

Moderator: *"I'm curious. Is there anybody on the stage that does not believe in Evolution?"*

Only three of the 10 candidates sheepishly raised their hand to confirm their unforgivable heresy. **(4)** Left wing bloggers took to the Internet to scoff at how "ignorant" and "uneducated" some of the candidates were. Perhaps the moderator should have asked: *"Do you believe in Soviet Soup with spontaneously forming DNA computer code leading to Marilyn & the Maggot"?*

Now *that* would have been funny!

Presidential candidates must now pledge allegiance to Darwinism.

FRANCIS COLLINS MUST GO!

Francis Collins, is a physician-geneticist and former head of The Human Genome Project; an international scientific research project with the goal of



determining the sequence of chemical pairs which make up human DNA, and of and mapping all of the genes of the human genome. Collins has written a number of books on science and DNA, including his bestselling book, *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*, in which he reveals how his study of DNA codes led him to abandon his previous Atheism.

Collins has been also elected to the Institute of Medicine and the National Academy of Sciences, and has received the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the National Medal of Science. When he was appointed to chair the NIH *(National Institute of Health)* in 2009, Collins' words caused "concern" among the tolerant. For example, the great scientist once wrote:

"I have led a consortium of scientists to read out the 3.1 billion letters of the human genome, our own DNA instruction book. As a believer, I see DNA, the information molecule of all living things, as God's language, and the elegance and complexity of our own bodies and the rest of nature as a reflection of God's plan.

I did not always embrace these perspectives. As a graduate student in physical chemistry in the 1970s, I was an atheist, finding no reason to postulate the existence of any truths outside of mathematics, physics and chemistry." **(5)**

Oh horrors! Collins believes in an Intelligent Code Writer! The appointment was sniped at by many snarky little media liberals as "controversial", with some calling for it to be withdrawn. But Collins is too well respected, even among his many Atheistic peers. His job won't be in danger.

*** Probably as a protective career move, Collins *surprisingly* claims that an intelligent God guided the Evolutionary process which connected Marilyn & the Maggot. The "Powers That Be" will sometimes hold their nose and "tolerate" a "Theistic Evolutionist"**.

BILL NYE VS KEN HAMM

In 2014, TV Science Celebrity, Bill Nye "the Science Guy", agreed to a public debate with Creationist Ken Ham. The Atheistic Left then attacked their fellow Atheist for even agreeing to participate! It was claimed that Nye's acceptance of the debate challenge gave Ham a sort of dignity that he did not deserve. Dan Arel of the Richard Dawkins Foundation, named after Evolutionary Biologist and Atheist guru Richard Dawkins, condemned Nye's decision:

"Scientists should not debate Creationists. Period." **(6)**

Ham, as even the Atheists were forced to concede, outperformed Mr. Nye. An exasperated Michael Schulson of The Daily Beast lamented:

"Last night, it was easy to pick out the smarter man on the stage. Oddly, it was the same man who was arguing that the earth is 6,000 years old.

Nye, meanwhile, spent three-quarters of the debate sounding like a clueless geek, even if his points were scientifically valid." **(7)**

Could it be, Mr. Schulson, that Bill Nye's unsatisfactory performance had less to do with being a poor debater, and more to do with the "difficulties" that come along with attempting to defend the indefensible?

These cases represent just the "tip of the iceberg" of the dogmatic intolerance from the Unscientific Atheists. Think about it, this very book you are now reading would never be allowed inside of an American Public School!

If Evolution is such a "proven fact", one would expect the Atheists to relish the opportunity to humiliate the hated Creationists in a public forum. What can be easier than arguing on the behalf of "proven" truth? Instead, they run and hide.

This leads us to the question: ***What are the dogmatic Atheists so damn afraid of?***

Hamm



Nye



Dawkins

Bill Nye upset Dawkins and his Unscientific Atheist crowd just by even agreeing to a debate with Hamm

ANTHONY FLEW: THE CONVERTED ATHEIST COMES UNDER FIRE

Anthony Flew was an English philosopher most notable for his work related to the philosophy of religion. Flew also coined the "No True Scotsman" logical fallacy. During the course of his career he taught at the universities of Oxford, Aberdeen, Keele and Reading, and at York University in Toronto.

For much of his career Flew was known as a strong advocate of Atheism, arguing that one should presuppose Atheism until empirical evidence of a God surfaces. In 2003 he was one of the signers of the Humanist *(Atheist)* Manifesto. However, in 2004 he stated an allegiance to Deism, more specifically a belief in the God of Aristotle. Flew stated that in keeping his lifelong commitment to go where the evidence leads; he now believed in the existence of God.

What mainly led the long-time Atheist Flew, at the age of 80, to finally acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Creative Intelligence was his study of DNA. Flew also cited the **"integrated complexity"** of living organisms as a reason for his sudden change of mind, and heart.

A book outlining all of his reasons for changing his position, *There is a God: How the World's Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind* was written by Flew in collaboration with Roy Abraham Varghese. The book *(and Flew's conversion itself)* became the subject of controversy and ridicule; following an article in *The New York Times Magazine* alleging that Flew had mentally declined, and that the book was primarily the work of Varghese. *(ad hominem attack)*

In 2005, Flew told *Christianity Today* that although he was not on the road to becoming a Christian convert, he reaffirmed his Deism: *"Since the beginning of my philosophical life I have followed the policy of Plato's Socrates: We must follow the argument wherever it leads."* **(8)**

In late 2006, Flew joined 11 other academics in urging the British government to teach intelligent design in the state schools.

In 2007, Flew said again that his Deism was the result of his *"growing empathy with the insight of Einstein and other noted scientists that there had to be an Intelligence behind the integrated complexity of the physical Universe" and "my own insight that the integrated complexity of life itself – which is far more complex than the physical Universe – can only be explained in terms of an Intelligent Source."* **(9)**

Not surprisingly, Flew's former colleagues and admirers, including Richard Dawkins, quickly abandoned him. Before his death in 2010, Flew denounced the intolerant Atheists as "bigots", and wrote:

"I have been denounced by my fellow unbelievers for stupidity, betrayal, senility and everything you can think of and none of them have read a word that I have ever written. **(10)**

Forget those idiots, Anthony. Mr. Flew, rest in peace.

CHAPTER 20

The Flow Chart of Fraud

Before we come face to face with the Eternal Designer *(next chapter)*, let's review the 'Flow Chart of Fraud' that has enthroned Unscientific Atheism. **The chronology of key events is set against a 150 year backdrop of intense and incessant fallacy-based propaganda that is seldom challenged**. Whole generations have passed through an educational system in which Darwinism is not even permitted to be examined. Author Dresden James, speaking in the general sense about Big Lie dynamics, aptly sums up the group-think at play here:

> ***"When a well-packaged web of lies has been sold gradually to the masses over generations, the truth will seem utterly preposterous and its speaker a raving lunatic."***

Here again, in a nutshell, is how the gradual selling process played out:

THE CHRONOLOGY OF A CON JOB

1859: Charles Darwin publishes *Origin of Species* and openly admits his work is based on conjecture.

1860: Elements of the International Press & Academia rush to embrace Darwinism. *(Innovation Fallacy)*

1860-1870: Marx, Engels and their Red legions give Darwinism a massive boost.

1866: German Darwinist Ernst Haeckel meets with Darwin & Huxley. He then develops the Theory of Embryonic Recapitulation. The diagrams to

support the theory will, in later years, be exposed as deliberately inaccurate renderings.

1912 -1953: The sensational Piltdown Man Hoax enjoys a 41 year run.

1924: Months after Stalin had assumed total supervision over the Sciences, Soviet “Lysenkoist” scientist Alexander Oparin invents the “Primordial Soup” theory.

1925: The ACLU’s Scopes Monkey Trial uses ‘Straw Man” to promote Evolution.

1953: Marxists Urey & sidekick Miller rig the “Primordial Soup” experiment.

1960: The film *Inherit the Wind* is a huge propaganda victory in favor of Evolution. Several TV versions are also later produced and hyped.

1970: A son of a Marxist, Stephen Jay Gould invents “Punctuated Equilibrium”. The theory is used to explain away the mystery of millions of missing links.

1970-2000: Due to huge funding advantages, Big Bang-ism gains in popularity.

2008: The American Press implies that belief in Evolution is a requirement to be President of the United States.

Concurrent to the above flow of events, is the “evolution” of a child’s perception; a perception that carries into adulthood. Let us trace the intellectual / psychological “evolution” of a little boy named “Billy”.

THE BIG LIE



Turn off your TV. Turn on your mind.

THE VIRUS OF ATHEISM

- As a child, sweet little Billy is taught to honor God and say his prayers by night.
- Billy's parents tell him to always listen to his teachers. Teacher knows best!
- In Middle School & High School, Billy is fed a strong dose of Unscientific Atheism by ignorant teachers who had previously been infected by it.
- The popular culture and TV media reinforce Big Bang-ism / Darwinism in Billy's vulnerable little mind.
- Adolescent Billy *(now known as Bill)* finally rejects any belief in an Intelligent Designer. His sense of betrayal causes him to hate all religion, and to instinctively recoil at the mere mention of "the G Word".
- Bill may, *or may not*, also come to reject the healthy moral teachings associated with his past faith in God. Let's hope not!

- As an adult with a family of his own, Bill *(now known as William)* instills his Unscientific Atheism in his own children. They may, *or may not*, have any sense of right and wrong.
- One day, William discovers that the School Board of his home town has decided to simply allow critical reviews of Darwinian Evolution to also be heard in the local schools.
- William the "tolerant" shows up at the local School Board meeting to denounce the Board members as fundamentalist, fascist, ignorant, uneducated, "Nazi", religious fanatics who do not understand Science.
- Self righteous William contacts the local branch of the ACLU and joins with other Atheistic parents in a lawsuit against the School Board.
- The dim-witted and cowardly Judge rules that any opposition to St. Darwin is a violation of the students "Constitutional Rights".
- Ignorant William, that ex little boy who once so beautifully tried to connect with the Great Eternal through his innocent bedside prayers, is now puffed up with pride over having spit in His maker's cosmic face.

The "Billies" of the modern world multiply like virulent zombies, each reinforcing the Darwinian delusion of the other. What a shame. What a tragedy. What a travesty of both Science and Theology. What a *sin!*

CHAPTER 21

The Positive Case for Intelligent Design

In addition to reason and deductive logic ruling out blind Atheistic Evolution and Theistic Evolution, we can also discern the “positive evidence” of the Creative Intelligence seen in the integrated complexity, perfect symmetry, and innate beauty of the creations themselves. Here are just a few of the mind-bending examples that we take for granted; and a few that you may not have known about.

The Spider: Without any mathematical training, protractor, straight edge or compass, the spider patiently spins a geometrical work of art that will ensnare his unsuspecting dinner. When a vibration is sensed, the spider arrives at the scene to wrap up his catch for tomorrow’s dinner. Who put such a clever scheme in its tiny head? **How did it master Euclidian geometry?**





The Venus Fly Trap: Neither animal nor insect, this brainless plant “knows” to opens its ”jaws” *(leaves)* and “wait” for an insect to land upon it. When an insect crawling along the leaves contacts a tiny hair on the surface, the trap’s timing mechanism is activated. ***But the trap does not close right away***.

Only when a *second hair* is contacted within 20 seconds of the first contact, then, and only then is the trap triggered. The "jaws" shut and the plant eats the insect. This requirement of redundant triggering serves as a safeguard against a waste of energy in trapping objects with no nutritional value. So, not only does the Venus Fly Trap "know" how to trap flies, it also "knows" how not to be fooled by a false alarm. A man-made mouse trap can't even do that!

The Angler-fish: The gruesome looking Angler-fish dwells in the deep sea. Unlike most fish that have to pursue their meals, the "lazy" Angler-fish lures its dinner into its open mouth. It lies in wait with a filament protruding from its head, which works exactly like a fishing line.



At the end of the line is a growth of flesh called the 'esca'. The esca mimics a tiny living prey object. The line from its head causes the esca to wiggle around like a tiny fish. When another fish comes to take the "bait", which is "coincidentally" dangling right in front of the Anglerfish's wide open mouth; dinner is served!

The Monarch Butterfly: Monarch Butterflies mate and then lay eggs on plants. Caterpillar larvae emerge, eat their own egg case, and then feed off plants. After two weeks, a caterpillar will spin a silk pad around itself as it hangs upside down. Inside the pad, a metamorphosis takes place.

Stunningly beautiful new Monarch butterflies emerge from the pads and wait for their wings to dry. Every few generations, these new creatures show

themselves capable of cross-country migrations to a pre-determined destination, and have even been known to cross the Atlantic.

The flight navigational patterns of Monarchs are based on a combination of the position of the sun in the sky and a time-compensated Sun compass that depends upon a “clock” based in their antennae. They also use the earth's magnetic field for orientation. The antennae contain crypto-chrome, a protein sensitive to the violet-blue part of the light spectrum. In the presence of violet light, it functions as a chemical compass.

Who installed such sophisticated GPS technology in a living piece of flying artwork that only just two weeks before was a pulpy sack, and just two weeks before that a lowly creepy crawler? Ah Chuck….”difficulties”…”difficulties”.

The Mimic Octopus: The Mimic Octopus is a camouflage-capable, shape shifting creature that can contort its body and color to “mimic” the appearance of 15 other organisms. At times, the mimicry is used to catch prey. At other times, mimicry is used to frighten off its own predators - by “changing” into the predator’s predator!

The creature is intelligent enough to discern which dangerous sea creature to impersonate that will mimic the greatest threat to its current predator. For example, scientists observed that when the Mimic Octopus is attacked by a damsel-fish, it will mimic the banded sea snake, *a known predator of the damsel-fish!*

The Emperor Penguin: The Emperor Penguins of Antarctica live in temperatures that can reach −60°, compounded by extreme wind chills associated with gusts of up to 100 mph. This bird does not fly. It dives for its food in deep water, “flying” at depths of up to 1200 feet; which is deeper than the Empire State Building is tall!

To sustain such depths, the Penguin has solid bones, instead of hollow bones like other birds species. Hollow bones full of air would otherwise cause trauma in a deep dive, much like what a scuba diver might experience.

To resist the cold, the Penguin's feathers are very densely packed over the skin surface; with about 100 feathers covering one square inch. Additional insulation is formed by downy filaments between the feathers and skin. The feathers stand erect on land, which reduces heat loss by trapping air next to the skin. But when diving, the plumage is flattened in water, thus waterproofing the skin and the downy under layer. The Penguin preens itself to improve insulation. Preening also keeps the plumage oily and water-repellent.

As amazing as such bi-functional *(diving and warming)* mechanisms are, the Penguin's ultimate defense against the Antarctica winds has to be seen to be believed. It is a heart-warming spectacle of unselfish teamwork unlike anything in the animal kingdom. A colony of Penguins will form a compact huddle of as many as 1000 birds. Each penguin leans forward on another penguin. Because the wind chill is least severe in the center of the huddle, the "children" are always huddled there, in body-heated cozy temperatures of up to 70 degrees!



Those on the outside will shuffle slowly around the edge of the formation and add themselves to the rotating huddle. The cuddling mob of penguins produces a slow churn. **Each unselfish penguin will have equal turns on both the colder outside of the spinning huddle, as well as inside the toasty center of the huddle**.

Who put this idea into their collective little brains? Comrade Oparins's Soup?

The Human Anatomy



Recall the old spiritual song "Dem Bones". The charming little melody was composed by songwriter James Weldon Johnson. It's not exactly Medical School - level Anatomy, but its meaning is nonetheless profound:

Verse

Toe bone connected to the foot bone

Foot bone connected to the heel bone

Heel bone connected to the ankle bone

Ankle bone connected to the shin bone

Shin bone connected to the knee bone

Knee bone connected to the thigh bone

Thigh bone connected to the hip bone

Hip bone connected to the back bone

Back bone connected to the shoulder bone

Shoulder bone connected to the neck bone

Neck bone connected to the head bone

Now hear the word of the Lord.

Dem bones, dem bones, dem dry bones.

Dem bones, dem bones, dem dry bones.

Dem bones, dem bones, dem dry bones.

Now hear the word of the Lord. **(1)**

Not one of those bones mentioned in Johnson's little ditty, in addition to the hundreds of others which he missed, can function without any other of the others already in place. The system *had to* have come together all at once. **That's the "integrated complexity" which so moved the philosopher Anthony Flew to convert from Atheism to Deism**. If the components of the skeletal system "evolved", then how could separate entities "know" in advance that they would eventually fit in with other complex parts?

Indeed, as that anonymous student once asked our Professor Melski, "*Which "evolved" first? The eye-ball or the eye-socket?* We can do an entire album of songs relating to the subject of complex interrelated parts working together. Sing it with me!

Dem veins, dem veins, dem dry veins, dem arteries, dem arteries, dem dry arteries, dem ligaments, dem ligaments, dem dry ligaments, dem muscles, dem muscles, dem dry muscles, dem organs, dem organs, dem dry organs, dem DNA codes, dem DNA codes, dem dry DNA codes.

The amazing stories of each and every living entity on this earth could fill up a library. There is the Beaver, that brilliant mechanical engineer whose dams actually transform local environments by creating watering locations for other animals.

There is the Honey Bee, a tireless builder, flower pollinator and craftsman with a division of labor production system that would make Henry Ford proud. No bees = no flowers. No flowers = no bees. There goes that "integrated complexity" thing again; an inexplicable Darwinian "difficulty" that has converted many an Atheist.

There is the male Peacock, who flashes his stunning artistic plumage, worthy of any art museum, in order to attract a female. Oh the lengths guys will go to just to impress a woman!

There are the various millipedes, some with as many as 750 little legs with microscopic feet that march in sync without ever tripping each other up.

And on and on and on the list of awe-inspiring life forms goes. These creative DNA code-driven miracles and I do mean *miracles*, did not and could not have blindly originated, evolved and regenerated out of Darwin's Daydream or Comrade Oparin's Soviet Soup. What's more, as even St. Stephen Gould of "Punctuated Equilibrium" fame admitted, the fossil record does indeed appear to reveal *sudden* outbreaks of life forms. Yet the hard core Atheist, his finger wagging in your face while foaming at the mouth, will continue to proclaim, *"Intelligent Design is nonsense! Evolution is a fact! Science! Science! Science!"* Talk about a "god-complex"!

The God of Fine-Tuning

Above and apart from the magnificent creations themselves; the conditions that allow the Universe to function, and for life on Earth to exist in the first place, can only occur when certain fundamental physical constants lie within a *very* narrow range. If any of several fundamental constants were only slightly

different, the Universe would not to be conducive to the establishment of matter, astronomical structures, elemental diversity, or life.

Examples of unimaginably precise fine-tuning include the ratios between carbon to oxygen; hydrogen to oxygen *(H2O / water)*, the size of the electric charge of the electron; strength of nuclear forces, amounts of radiation, strength of gravitational forces, the ratio of the masses of the proton and the electron, and the distance of Earth from the Sun, just to name a few. **Every calculation had to be "just right"**. Change any of those numbers by just the tiniest, and I do mean *tiniest* of fractions and there is no viable Universe, and certainly no human life!

Perhaps the most extreme example of life-sustaining fine-tuning pertains to the Cosmological Constant. The Cosmological Constant is a term for an anti-gravity force present in space. Just how precisely set is this necessary fine-tuning?

When cosmologists calculated its effect on the Universe, they found that if this force was off by just 1 part in a trillion, trillion, trillion, trillion, trillion, trillion, trillion, trillion, trillion, trillion; the Universe would be so drastically different that it would be impossible for the Earth and human life to have come into existence.

This would be akin to the liquid batter for a cake not taking its solid final shape merely because it was removed 0.000000000000000000000000000000000…1 of a second too soon from the oven; or, conversely, burning to a carbonized crisp because it was left in the oven for that same infinitesimal fraction of a second too long. This degree of life-sustaining fine-tuning logically demands a Fine Tuner!

As even St. Stephen Hawking has had to concede:

*"The laws of science, as we know them at present, contain many fundamental numbers … The remarkable fact is that the values of these numbers seem to have been **very finely adjusted** to make possible the development of life."* **(2)** (emphasis added)

And yet, Messrs. Hawking, Dawkins and others refuse to even entertain the possibility that Intelligent fine-tuning is at work in the Universe, opting to

instead search for *(concoct)* new and even ‘insaner’ theories of “The Multiverse” and “Of Everything” to explain away this “inconvenient” reality. Mad scientists indeed!

Were the Supreme Designer Himself to assume the shape of a 1,000 foot tall winged giant, fly down to Earth, angrily rip open the roof of the Atheist’s home, pluck the stubborn fool out of his bed, and fly him about the Universe while revealing the secrets of the great unknown - our scholarly Darwinist Big Banger would look at his Maker and finally reply: *“What a marvelous specimen of high human evolution you are. You must return with me to the University so that my colleagues can see what we will all look like a billion years from now.”*

1- The mathematical precision of the laws and elements of the Universe is its own “DNA” 2- If the Universe was “only” 1,000,000,000,000,000,000 + times more precise than a top-of-the-line Rolex watch, you would not be here!

The God of Mathematics

*The mathematically-based **'Fibonacci Spiral'** pattern is perfectly written in outer space, in our hair growth pattern, in sea shells, ….*

…..in plants, in sea-horse tails, in hurricanes and much more.

The Earth's Protective Force Field (a recent discovery)

*CNN, December 1, 2014: Earth has its own 'Star Trek'-like Force Field

*"The University of Colorado has announced a discovery **7,200 miles above Earth of a protective shield** similar to the force fields you might see in "Star Trek." The discovery of this barrier in the Van Allen radiation belts suggests a new explanation for how "killer electrons" are held at bay. **This invisible shield, which was found at the inner edge of the outer Van Allen belt, protects against high-energy electrons**, which have the potential to fry satellites, threaten astronauts and degrade space systems during intense solar storms."*

***"It's almost like these electrons are running into a glass wall in space,"** said Daniel Baker, director of CU-Boulder's Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space.*

"Somewhat like the shields created by force fields on 'Star Trek' that were used to repel alien weapons, we are seeing an invisible shield blocking these electrons. It's an extremely puzzling phenomenon." **(3)** (emphasis added)



The Earth's protective field operates 7,000 miles into space. Did this space-based defensive system randomly "evolve" too?

CHAPTER 22

Geniuses Who Believe in God

It is also a fallacy, no, a downright *lie*, to state, as Atheists so often do, that *"the science is settled"*. Though a minority, there are indeed many Phd-caliber physicists, mathematicians, astronomers, biologists, geologists and other professionals who dispute Atheism on scientific grounds.

A 2009 Pew Research poll revealed that 33% of scientists working at "elite" Universities expressed a belief in God, with an additional 18% expressing a belief in "some type of higher spirit or power". **(1)** Some of that can be attributed to early religious upbringing of course, but many are actually non religious Deists.

But you won't ever see an educated God-believing scientist being hyped in the media like Hawking the Infallible and friends routinely are. If an opposing view does manage to penetrate the media filter, you can be sure that the "spokesman" will be some inarticulate, fire & brimstone breathing fanatic. *(Appeal to Ridicule & Straw Man / Chapter 3)*

This undeniable fact of disagreement existing within the scientific community is important to note *not* for the purpose of disproving Evolution by appealing to cherry-picked "authorities". The sole intent here is to disarm yet another key weapon in the Atheistic arsenal of fallacies; *(Case Closed Fallacy / Chapter 3)*

It is time to put to rest the dirty slander that Creationists are stupid, uneducated, and ignorant, closed minded blah, blah, blah. In so doing, the Unscientific Atheists reveal the weakness of their own position. Again, name calling and ridiculing are fine, *after* a case has been clearly proven and your adversary stubbornly refuses to accept it.

For example, it is not acceptable to call someone an idiot for strongly believing that 2 + 2 = 5. But after you have counted out 2 marbles, and then 2 more, and then recounted all of them to prove there are 4; and your subject continues to persist in his original argument; then he deserves the abuse!

That's why your humble author is justified in heaping sarcasm and abuse on Atheist Evolutionists who insist that Creationism is only for stupid crazies!

Now, let's return to the subject at hand. Following are just a few of the absolute, uncontested geniuses who maintained a belief in an Intelligent Design, in one form or another. Let's see some of these snarky little liberal hipsters call these guys "stupid".

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN (1706 – 1790)



American Founding Father Ben Franklin was actually world-renowned as a "polymath"; an expert in multiple fields of study. Franklin was a leading author, printer, political theorist, politician, postmaster, scientist, inventor, civic activist, statesman, and diplomat. As a scientist he was a major figure in the American Enlightenment and an expert in the history of physics. His discoveries and theories regarding electricity were revolutionary. Franklin invented the lightning rod, bifocals, the Franklin stove, and more.

In addition to his formidable command of English, Franklin mastered the French and German languages, and could read in Latin, Spanish and Italian.

Benjamin Franklin was raised as a Christian, but he is believed to have become a Deist as an adult - one whose belief in God, and God's will, are

based only on reason and nature. Through reason alone, a Deist arrives at a belief in a “Supreme Architect” or “Cosmic Clockmaker”.

At the closed door Constitutional Convention in 1789, the senior statesmen recommended that the assembled leaders remain humble and seek God’s wisdom to illuminate their deliberations:

“In this situation of this Assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when present to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understandings? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth - that God governs in the affairs of men.” **(2)**

As a Deist, what Franklin is really suggesting is that the delegates, through reason, can tap into the discernible wisdom of Nature’s God to *“illuminate their own understandings”*.

THOMAS JEFFERSON (1743 – 1826)



At a 1962 White House dinner honoring the Nobel Prize winners of the Western Hemisphere, President John F. Kennedy remarked:

“I think this is the most extraordinary collection of talent, of human knowledge, that has ever gathered at the White House with the possible exception of when Thomas Jefferson dined alone.” **(3)**

Kennedy wasn’t joking either!

Jefferson, like Franklin, was a leader of the American Enlightenment and also a polymath who could read and write 6 *languages (Ancient Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, and English)*. Jefferson was deeply

interested in science, invention, architecture, religion and philosophy. He served as President of the American Philosophical Society and founded the University of Virginia after serving as America's 3rd President.

Jefferson was the principal author of the Declaration of Independence, America's long forgotten founding document issued on July 4th, 1776. Like Franklin, Jefferson was also a Deist. The Deist belief system is evident in the immortal words in which Jefferson enshrined God into America's "DNA":

"When in the Course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, ***the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God*** *entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.*

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator *with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."* **(4)** (emphasis added)

Jefferson: Rights, including property rights, come from God and are inalienable.

Marx/Atheism: There is no God. The State will let you know what you can and cannot do.

Of course, the Atheist will argue: *"That's not fair! Franklin and Jefferson died decades before Darwin's Origin of Species was published!"*

Ah, yeah…right. Like I'm sure Jefferson and Franklin would have been blown away by Chuckie Darwin's birdie beaks, sketches, *"imperfect"* geological record, *"difficulties"*, logical fallacies, "Perils of Pauline" tricks, – not to mention con man Haeckel's faked embryo sketches and Comrade Oparin's Magic Soviet Soup.

We can just imagine how Franklin's breathless letter to Jefferson might read:

"Tom!

How's retired life at Monticello treating you?

You simply must have a look at what this Darwin chap just published. By observing finch beaks, it has been scientifically proven that we all came from pond scum.

Boy oh boy, did we ever get this God stuff wrong!"

Yours in Liberty

Benny

THOMAS EDISON (1847-1931)



The great scientist, inventor and businessman known as "The Wizard of Menlo Park (NJ)" brought us the phonograph, the motion picture camera, and a long-lasting, practical light bulb. After causing a bit of stir by making some disparaging comments about religion, Edison, in a letter to a colleague, clarified his views:

"You have misunderstood the whole article, because you jumped to the conclusion that it denies the existence of

God. There is no such denial, what you call God I call Nature, ***the Supreme intelligence that rules matter****. All the article states is that it is doubtful in my opinion if our intelligence or soul or whatever one may call it lives hereafter as an entity."* **(5)**

Here is another Edison quote, brought to us by his close friend and businessman of automobile tire fame, Harvey Firestone:

"I am convinced that the body is made up of entities that are intelligent and are directed by this Higher Power. When one cuts his finger, I believe it is the intelligence of these entities which heals the wound. When one is sick, it is the intelligence of these entities which brings convalescence. You know that there are living cells in the body so tiny that the microscope cannot find them at all. The entities that give life and soul to the human body are finer still and lie infinitely beyond the reach of our finest scientific instruments." **(6)**

Edison's observation about living cells is as profound as it is mind-boggling. What else but an *intelligent force* can explain how the cells of the body go into action like so many trained paramedics? What is guiding them? Who or what "taught" them to perform complex micro-surgery? These cells don't even have a brain!

It can't be the human brain instructing them. If that were the case, then how do we explain sperm cells doing what they do after they have left the body and entered a foreign body? *(Trying not to be graphic here).* Think about it. A man's seed can be saved in a sperm bank for years. And yet, even after he is dead and gone, those cells will know exactly what to do if injected into a foreign female specimen. Whose brain is guiding this programmed team of DNA-carrying swimmers to the finish-line? It is certainly not the dead donor's! Edison was convinced of a higher intelligence at work. It's simple deduction.

NIKOLA TESLA (1856-1943)



Tesla’s visionary genius can be described as “freakish”. It is he, even more so than the great Edison, who is responsible for the electricity revolution. Tesla's seemingly miraculous inventions made him world-famous. He even envisioned wireless technology, robotics and the directed-energy weapons of today *(Star Wars)*.

A sycophantic reporter once asked St. Einstein what it felt like to be the smartest man alive. Einstein is said to have replied:

“I don’t know. You’ll have to ask Nikola Tesla.” **(7)**

Like Edison, Tesla believed that the Universe itself was possessed by a living, intelligent entity, God, of which we are all part of. Though not religious, Tesla held the moral ideals of Christianity and Buddhism in high regard.

"The gift of mental power comes from God, Divine Being, and if we concentrate our minds on that truth, we become in tune with this great power."

To me the universe is simply a marvelous mechanism, and the most complex forms of human life, as human beings, are nothing else but automatic engines, controlled by external influence. Through incessant observation I have so convinced myself of the truth of this that I cannot perform any act or even conceive a thought without locating at once the external stimulus that prompted it.

"There is this to be said, however, that science without hope is not satisfactory, and unless one has some ideals he cannot achieve happiness. The religious is the most lofty ideal, and it seems that the great reformers who, ages ago, laid down rules of conduct were right in their conclusions that a peaceful existence and a continued onward march of man on this globe is essentially dependent on the conception of a God.” **(8)**

WERNHER VON BRAUN (1912-1977)

Von Braun was a German rocket engineer and one of the leading figures in the development of rocket technology in Germany during World War II and, later on, in the United States. **Von Braun is regarded as the "Father of Rocket Science"**.

Under NASA, he served as director of the Marshall Space Flight Center and as chief architect of the booster that propelled the Apollo spacecraft to the Moon. One NASA colleague said of Von Braun:

***"He is "without doubt, the greatest rocket scientist in history."* (9)**

In a 1963 newspaper opinion piece entitled "My Faith", Von Braun wrote of his scientifically based faith with moving eloquence:

"Through science man strives to learn more of the mysteries of creation. Through religion he seeks to know the Creator.

Neither operates independently. It is as difficult for me to understand a scientist who does not acknowledge the presence of a superior rationality behind the existence of the universe as it is to comprehend a theologian who would deny the advances of science.

Far from being independent or opposing forces, science and religion are sisters. Both seek a better world. While science seeks control over the forces of nature around us, religion controls the forces of nature within us. As we learn more and more about nature, we become more deeply impressed and humbled by its orderliness and unerring perfection. Our expanding knowledge of the laws of the universe have enabled us to send men out of

their natural environment into the strange new environment of space, and return them safely to earth.

Since we first began the exploration of space through rocketry, we have regularly received letters expressing concern over what the writers call our "tampering" with God's creation.

One of the Russian cosmonauts stated flatly after his earth-circling flight in space: "I was looking around attentively all day during my flight, but I didn't find anybody there – neither angels nor God..."

***Such shallow thinking is childish and pathetic**. I have no fear that a physical object will harm any spiritual entities. Manned space flight is an amazing achievement. But it has opened for us thus far only a tiny door for viewing the awesome reaches of space. **Our outlook through this peephole at the vast mysteries or the universe only confirms our belief in the certainty of its Creator**.*

***Finite man cannot comprehend an omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, and infinite God**. Any effort to visualize God, to reduce him to our comprehension, to describe him in our language, beggars his greatness.*

I find it best through faith to accept God as an intelligent will, perfect in goodness, revealing himself in the world of experience more fully down through the ages, as man's capacity for understanding grows.

For spiritual comfort I find assurance in the concept of the fatherhood of God. For ethical guidance I rely on the corollary concept of the brotherhood of man." **(10)** (emphasis added)

BENJAMIN CARSON (1951 - Present)

There are many living men of high intellect and first class scientific achievement who strongly refute Atheism as well; enough to fill up an entire manuscript. Let's revisit just one of the better known ones; world renowned Dr. Benjamin Carson *(retired)* of Johns Hopkins University.



Though perhaps not quite the mega-genius on the level of the aforementioned historical legends; the talented Dr. Carson is credited with being the first brain surgeon to ever successfully separate conjoined twins joined at the head. He is also adept at separating fact from fantasy:

"I don't believe in evolution .... I simply don't have enough faith to believe that something as complex as our ability to rationalize, think, and plan, and have a moral sense of what's right and wrong, just appeared." **(11)**

On another occasion:

"The first thing is, how does something come out of nothing? And the second thing is, how does life evolve from non-life? If you want to talk about Fairy Tales; I mean those are incredible Fairy Tales.

I fully accept natural selection. It seems perfectly logical, perfectly reasonable, and you can document it. …But to grasp that and say that this is the foundational pillar of proof that Evolution occurs is, I think, is taking it a little bit too far.

The Evolutionists look at the similarities that you see in the various life forms and they say "because this creature and that creature share the same type of digestive system or the same type of structures in their head that clearly one evolved from the other.

I don't know how clear that is. Because if you have an Intelligent Designer, why wouldn't he use a basic structure that works on multiple different creatures? Just like an automobile manufacturer. General Motors, same basic chassis for a Chevrolet, Buick, a Pontiac, or a Cadillac. Any yet, they are all different, and one did not evolve from the other. Why would you have to go and completely change the motor, the chassis, and all other

infrastructure because you are creating a different model? It doesn't make any sense to me." **(12)**

Me neither Doc! Dr. Carson also spoke of the moral dangers of widespread Atheism:

"By believing we are the product of random acts, we eliminate morality and the basis of ethical behavior." **(13)**

Carson later clarified that remark:

"People who believe in survival of the fittest might have more difficulty deriving where their ethics come from, but a lot of evolutionists are very ethical people." **(14)**

To expand for a moment on Carson's statement, before we close this chapter; there are indeed many moral and ethical hard core Atheists. It's a pity that they lack the imagination, intelligence, and information to figure out that a Divine Intelligence gave them that conscience *(as well as our dark sides)*, just as surely as He gave us our physical attributes.

In suppressing even so much as the *discussion* of Intelligent Design, the Ethical Atheist, though still living a good life personally, is inadvertently doing immeasurable harm to society at large. Even the anti-Catholic, Deistic French philosopher Voltaire conceded that faith in the Divine was an essential pillar of civilization:

"If God does not exist, it would be necessary to invent one." **(15)**

Ethical Atheists can't quite understand that philosophical concept. Reason does reveal that man needs to seek the proverbial "face of God" for guidance in the affairs of men. The good news is that we don't have to invent Him. We only need to figure out His will, by utilizing the very same reasoning capacities He has endowed us with. There will be more on that concept later on.

ALBERT EINSTEIN (1879-1955)



In light of the view, expressed in Chapter 4, that Einstein was over-rated and his theory was passionately rejected by Tesla and others, the reader may find it strange to see his words quoted here in support of this book's argument. But the fact remains, like it or not, St. Albert is still generally regarded as a scientific deity, especially by Atheists. Therefore, Einstein's *repudiation* of Atheism and support of the Pantheism of the philosopher Spinoza carries *a ton* of weight.

Pantheism is essentially the same as Deism. It is the belief that the Universe is possessed of - and animated by - its own creative and intelligent force; an awe-inspiring force *(Spirit)* which cannot be fully understood, but is nonetheless clearly evidenced by the application of our own reason and scientific observation.

Einstein on Pantheism / Deism:

***"I believe in Spinoza's God, who reveals himself in the harmony of all that exists**, not in a God who concerns himself with the fate and the doings of mankind."* **(16)** (emphasis added)

"Scientific research can reduce superstition by encouraging people to think and view things in terms of cause and effect. Certain it is that a conviction, akin to religious feeling, of the rationality and intelligibility of the world lies behind all scientific work of a higher order... This firm belief, a belief bound up with a deep feeling, in a superior mind that reveals itself in the world of experience, represents my conception of God. In common parlance this may be described as "pantheistic"." **(17)**

Einstein was also highly critical of Atheists, and expressed disgust with their unauthorized appropriation of his name as a support for their Atheism.

Einstein on Atheism:

“You may call me an agnostic, but I do not share the crusading spirit of the professional atheist whose fervor is mostly due to a painful act of liberation from the fetters of religious indoctrination received in youth. I prefer an attitude of humility corresponding to the weakness of our intellectual understanding of nature and of our own being." **(18)**

"In view of such harmony in the cosmos which I, with my limited human mind, am able to recognize, there are yet people who say there is no God. But what really makes me angry is that they quote me for the support of such views.” **(19)**

Einstein explored the belief that man could not understand the nature of God. In an interview published in 1930, Einstein, in response to a question about whether or not he considered himself as a Pantheist, explained:

“Your question is the most difficult in the world. It is not a question I can answer simply with yes or no. ***I am not an Atheist****. I do not know if I can define myself as a Pantheist. The problem involved is too vast for our limited minds. May I not reply with a parable? The human mind, no matter how highly trained, cannot grasp the universe. We are in the position of a little child, entering a huge library whose walls are covered to the ceiling with books in many different tongues. The child knows that someone must have written those books. It does not know who or how. It does not understand the languages in which they are written. The child notes a definite plan in the arrangement of the books, a mysterious order, which it does not comprehend, but only dimly suspects. That, it seems to me, is the attitude of the human mind, even the greatest and most cultured, toward God. We see a universe marvelously arranged, obeying certain laws, but we understand the laws only dimly. Our limited minds cannot grasp the mysterious force that sways the constellations.* ***I am fascinated by Spinoza's Pantheism****. I admire even more his contributions to modern thought. Spinoza is the greatest of modern philosophers, because he is the first philosopher who deals with the soul and the body as one, not as two separate things.”* **(20)** (emphasis added)

And according to biographer Walter Isaacson, Einstein was more inclined to denigrate Atheists than religious people. Einstein once wrote:

"[T]he fanatical Atheists...are like slaves who are still feeling the weight of their chains which they have thrown off after hard struggle. They are creatures who—in their grudge against the traditional 'opium of the people'—cannot hear the music of the spheres." **(21)**

Although Einstein did not believe in a personal God, he indicated that he would never combat such belief because *"such a belief seems to me preferable to the lack of any transcendental outlook."* **(22)**

So; take that, Atheists! Your "greatest scientific genius who ever lived" was actually a Pantheist with an animosity towards intolerant Atheists.

CHAPTER 23

Face to Face With the Big 'G'

Debunking Darwinism and "accidental creation" has enabled us to logically deduce the reality of the Intelligent Designer. This may satisfactorily answer the "who / what" behind our existence, but what about the "why"? Can logic and reason answer the age old question of *"Why are we all here"?*

Indeed it can, and with far less examination than the question of "who / what", which we addressed in previous chapters. Behold all of the other living creatures on the planet. Be they plant, animal or insect; all are engineered for one purpose and one purpose only. That is to survive and procreate, nothing more. Some of the more intelligent specimens can be very creative at doing so, but at the end of the day, even apes and dolphins are nothing more than eaters and procreators.

But man is different. Whereas all other creatures can only go left or right, man can go up or down. **Can anything be more self-evident than the fact that man was intelligently engineered to rise up to become something much greater than a cave-dwelling hunter-gatherer?** Man can build civilizations, or tear them down.

Great poets and writers have always had the ability to intuitively sense and see what others cannot. It was 20th Century American poet Harry Kemp who captured the essence of the "why" behind mankind's existence. The final verse of *The Architect* says it all:

But chief of all Thy wondrous works,
Supreme of all Thy plan,
Thou hast put an upward reach
***Into the heart of man*. (1)** (emphasis added)

That "upward reach" of civilization is man's purpose! Tesla referred to it as *"the onward march of man."* **(2)** It's elementary dear reader; elementary.



From cave art to space travel. Isn't it obvious that the 'Upward Reach' was programmed into mankind!

Moving right along; now that the "who" *and* the "why" of our existence have been logically established, there remains one more lesson to understand; the *"how to"*? Is there a playbook, a set of Divine instructions that we can deduce, which can guide us to fulfilling our assigned mission – that inspiring "upward reach" that Kemp so elegantly wrote about? Of course there is!

As surely as the Great Programmer fine-tuned the laws of the Universe; and as surely as He embedded a highly sophisticated GPS navigation system within the speck brain of the Monarch Butterfly, He has also endowed man with an inner navigational system. The only difference is that whereas the Butterfly has no choice but to follow its navigational system, we do have a choice.

Our internal Navigation System, necessary to fulfill our assigned "upward reach", is intangible, yet every bit as real as our hearts, lungs, hands, eyes etc. Let's have a look at how the HNS *(Human Navigational System)* works, in the form of an allegorical tale.

Exercise your imagination for a moment, and visualize the Supreme Creative Intelligence of the Universe assuming a shining human-like form for the benefit of your limited understanding. Let's call this earthy manifestation of God, "Mr. G".

With rays of bright light emanating from his eyes, ears and mouth, the 10 foot tall Mr. G shows up at your front door one evening. Though never before religious, you can't help but fall to your knees in awed reverence. "*You don't have to kneel. It's cool."* He says.

He reveals that he has come to Earth to review the progress which mankind has made towards the "upward reach" which He had planned for us. Mr. G seems like a nice enough being, but make no mistake, He is deadly serious about wanting to assess His "return on investment".

He explains that if He does not come away impressed with man's condition, He will obliterate the Planet into a trillion pieces and start from scratch. So, dear reader, it's up to you to serve as humanity's advocate, and Mr. G's tour guide. The fate of humanity rests in your hands. **You had better not screw this up!**

Now, you must approach this little exercise with no preconceptions in mind. Forget about what various religious and cultural traditions have said about God. Forget your own opinions and prejudices. Just pretend you know nothing about any of the world's religions and nothing about what Mr. G's own tastes and opinions are. All that you know for sure is that He is who He says He is; nothing else. Remember now, this isn't about your opinions; it's about you persuading Mr. G to spare the rest of us.

On Day 1 of your Divine Odyssey, Mr. G asks to be introduced to the world's greatest men of Science and Invention, past or present. If He deems them to be up to his intellectual standards, He will spare the world for another day. At a café down the block, Messrs. Archimedes, Newton, Roentgen, Edison, Tesla and von Braun are enjoying a lively discussion of classical science; everything from buoyancy to gravity to electricity to astronomy to X-Rays to light bulbs to the commercial uses of electricity.

Meanwhile, at a park up the block, Theoretical Scientists Darwin, Oparin, Hawking, Dawkins and Nye are conducting a mathematical circle-jerk over Evolution, Soup-ism, Big Bang-ism, and time warps. Where would you take Mr. G? Be honest now!

On Day 2, Mr. G asks you to take him to an Art Museum. If He deems the assembled works to be up to His Divine standards of beauty, He will spare the world for yet another day. Would you take Him to the Louvre Museum in Paris and the Hermitage in Russia? Or would you guide Him through New York's Museum of Modern Art, where the imbecilic "in crowd" stares in amazement at twisted pieces of metal and random paint blotches spilled on canvas? Be honest!

On Day 3, Mr. G asks to meet a healthy family. Do you go 'Norman Rockwell' traditional; hard working dad, stay at home mom, 3 kids, dog, home with a white picket fence? *(Something very hard to find in today's Marxist-Progressive Era of heavy taxes, debt based currency and ceaseless inflation)* Or do you go "modern family"; two homosexuals sharing an apartment with a divorced lesbian friend and two adopted children; one of them "transgendered"? Be honest!

On Day 4, Mr. G wants to attend a concert. You might go Classical *(Andrea Bocelli, Mozart),* smooth Jazz *(Kenny G),* or even take a chance with *Rhythm & Blues (Luther Van Dross.)* But you know damn well you wouldn't take Him to see Beyonce the Glorified Pole Dancer breathlessly rap-panting about her all night sex sessions with her one-time drug-dealer husband, 'Jay Z'. *(Drunk in Love).*

On Day 5, Mr. G asks to see the local medical facilities at work. You might take him to the Emergency Room to see medical heroes in action, or perhaps a local eye doctor, ear doctor or dentist. But you sure wouldn't take Him to an abortion clinic to see sentient 3-9 month old fetuses being dismantled and discarded. Would you?

On Day 6, Mr. G asks to meet with the great rulers and statesmen of the world, past or present. You might introduce Him to Solon, Pericles, Cicero, Marcus Aurelius, Charlemagne, Bismarck, and George Washington. But would you really want to show off the likes of Bill Clinton, George Bush, Dick Cheney, John McCain, Tony Blair, Obongo or Hillary Clinton to Him?

On Day 7, Mr. G wants to take in a movie. Do you opt for *Gone With the Wind*, or would you take Him to the latest degenerate, violent, borderline pornographic filth churned out by Marxist Hollywood? *Fifty Shades of Grey*, Mr. G? I think not!

On Day 8, Mr. G wants to see how humanity pays homage to Him. You might bring him to an Eastern Orthodox Church to witness the solemn ceremonial splendor of its mass; or perhaps to a Mosque full of humbled men on prayer-mats; or to a Baptist Church for some good ole fire & brimstone admonitions to avoid evil. But it is highly doubtful that you would want Him to witness some fast-talking, multi-millionaire, book-selling, jet-

setting TV preacher in a $3000 suit spewing empty ‘feel good’, motivational fluff.

You know which choices you would make. And *I know that you know* which options you would select. But exactly *how* did you know which options would save the Earth from the righteous wrath of Mr. G?

It’s simple. You just followed, *out of necessity*, your God given HNS *(Human Navigational System)*. It’s one part “gut instinct” and one part “conscience”; the universal human conscience which expresses itself in the unique cultural forms of the world’s various religions. This is what the snooty, snarky, snobby, intolerant, spiritually illiterate dogmatic Atheist can never understand.

When man, individually and *collectively*, follows his HNS, the “upward reach” advances. But when man ignores his HNS; he embarks on the path to degradation and misery. Russian President Vladimir Putin, commenting on Western decadence, noted this tragic trend in an address to his *formerly* Communist nation:

“Many Euro-Atlantic countries have moved away from their roots, including Christian values. Policies are being pursued that place on the same level a multi-child family and a same-sex partnership, a faith in God and a belief in Satan. ***This is the path to degradation.”*** **(3)** (emphasis added)

Were an American President to ever say such a thing, the “tolerant” Left would seek his impeachment!

By rebelling against Nature’s Laws, modern man has placed himself in an adversarial position against the very same Intelligent Designer to which he owes his existence. One can pee and moan all he wants about “tolerance”

and “outdated” moral values. The fact remains that the iron laws of Nature and Nature’s God don’t give a rat’s rear-end about your “moral relativism” or your inflated “intellect”. Nor does He care if you are offended by His “political incorrectness”. Follow the HNS and prosper - materially, culturally and emotionally. **Ignore the HNS and your civilization will, in due time, die a well deserved and probably violent death**.

Here is the surest way to accurately tune into your HNS. The next time you find yourself *reflexively* suppressing a certain thought because it is not “politically correct”, understand that 99 times out of 100, that original impulse was actually your God-given HNS talking. Don’t suppress it. Just go with it! In an upside society in full rebellion against the Natural Law of the Intelligent Designer, that which is “politically incorrect” is actually logically correct - *divinely* correct.

Political correctness *(progressivism)* is a form of psychological tyranny over the minds of men; the ultimate “intolerance”. Thomas Jefferson vehemently denounced such forms of mind tyranny:

"*I have sworn upon the Altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."* **(4)**

It is man-made mind tyranny that is leading us astray. With American *(also European)* divorce rates above 50%, more than 40% of all children born to fatherless homes, people being raped and murdered like flies, scores of millions chained to eternal debt usury, prisons overflowing with the most vile specimens of corrupted de-Deified Atheistic humanity, television and radio bombarding the impressionable psyches of our young people with the most soul-crushing obscenities and vulgarities, and the transvestite / sex change trend now being fully “normalized”, it is quite apparent that the Atheistic West is committing suicide.

CHAPTER 24

Nice Guys Finish Last

There is another element of the logically derived Natural Law that is often overlooked by “the good guys”. You see, it is not enough to merely be virtuous. The rules of Nature and Nature’s God require that people and healthy societies be tough as nails, and yes, *intolerant* in the face of creeping evil and degradation.

Irish philosopher Edmond Burke warned:

“All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.” **(1)**

The Grand Designer will not help you during a home invasion. You can pray all you want as you cower in the corner begging for your life. But unless you summon up the internal *God-given* fire necessary to pick up that fireplace poker and jam it through the invader’s eye-socket, and then whack his skull a dozen or so times for good measure, you will be the one to die a horrible death instead of him.

The Christian religion describes Jesus as the gentle and compassionate personification of God on earth. But upon seeing the money lenders using the Church grounds as headquarters for their loan-sharking operation, the “Prince of Peace” grabbed hold of a whip and opened up a can of Holy ‘whoop-ass’ on the greedy crooks. That’s probably what got Jesus killed too.

The Hindu tradition describes Krishna as the gentle and compassionate vegetarian personification of God on earth. But when the great archer Arjuna developed cold feet over the prospect of having to wage a just war

against his own relatives, it was Krishna who urged him to suppress his soft feelings and do what needed to be done to triumph over evil.



Jesus beats the money lenders / Krishna encourages Arjuna to kill his enemies without remorse.

The theologians and philosophers of antiquity all understood that in a world of perpetual struggle between good and evil, the "tolerance" of creeping evil is in itself a vice, not a virtue. What bigger folly can there be than to afford "tolerance" to the very same vile bigots and bullies who will not "tolerate" so much as even the mere *suggestion* of Intelligent Design?

These "progressives" are willing to "tolerate" Bestiality Brothels - now legal and flourishing in several European nations - in which helpless sheep, llamas, and dogs are tied down and raped for profit. **(2)** Yet their storied "tolerance" will not permit this very book in their schools or publishing houses. How are we to ever "do business" with such cruel tyrants of the mind?

Legendary baseball manager Leo Durocher famously put it this way; ***"Nice guys finish last."***

Nature and Nature's God despise weakness in men, and will punish it severely. In that respect, there is indeed a *"survival of the fittest"* dynamic



at play between the forces of good and evil.

There is one final point on this matter of evil. The question is frequently raised by believers and Atheists alike, *"Why would a God allow so much evil in the world?"*

Here again, reason leads us to the inescapable conclusion that the Great Engineer embedded man not with evil, but with the *potential* capacity for evil and self-destructiveness. An auto maker does not create a car for the purpose of breaking down. But over the course of the car's "life", complex systems will often go awry, especially if not well maintained by the owner. A small dose of any of the chief vices is actually necessary not only for man's survival, but also for fulfilling the mission of Kemp's "upward reach "or Tesla's "onward march."

For example, anger is considered a deadly sin by all of the world's religions. But as we have already reviewed, without some bit of fire in our bellies, a pack of passive eunuchs cannot survive, let alone move forward, in a world of eternal struggle.

The sin of lust is also destructive for a variety of reasons. Lust brings unwanted and unguided dependent population into existence, destroys marriages, spreads diseases and even cancers, creates compulsive addictions, and warps the meaning of true love and healthy romance. And yet, absent some degree of carnal desire, man cannot procreate. Psychologists have also linked controlled sex drive with high achievement. Sorry "progressives", but it is 'macho men' who move the world forward, not feminized eunuchs and girly-man "hipsters".

The sin of greed can consume a man's positive energy, causing a wealthy man to continually prey upon his brother instead of benefitting mankind. But without some degree of material ambition, man would never have emerged from the primitive simplicity of the hunter-gatherer existence.

It is man's free will *(also God given)* that causes him to overdose on the necessary medicine of a few milligrams of "spunk". The spiritually minded believe that there exists a corresponding force of evil that pulls us towards overdosing on the necessary vices. You know; the dude with the horns & pitchfork?

During his sad years in Stalin's Soviet Gulag, the great philosopher Solzhenitsyn came to understand many truths not previously revealed to him. He later wrote:



"In prison, both in solitary confinement and outside solitary too, a human being confronts his grief face to face. This grief is a mountain, but he has to find space inside himself for it, to familiarize himself with it, to digest it, and it him. This is the highest form of moral effort, which has always ennobled every human being. A duel with years and with walls constitutes moral work and a path upward - if you can climb it." **(3)**

It was in prison that Solzhenitsyn came to understand the duality of good and evil:

"But the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being. And who is willing to destroy a piece of his own heart? During the life of any heart this line keeps changing place; sometimes it is squeezed one way by exuberant evil and sometimes it shifts to allow enough space for good to flourish.

One and the same human being is, at various ages, under various circumstances, a totally different human being. At times he is close to being a devil, at times to sainthood. But his name doesn't change, and to that name we ascribe the whole lot, good and evil." **(4)**

In order to tilt the balance of power in favor of the good side, man employs such diverse tactics as philosophy, contemplation, introspection, meditation,

chanting, fasting and prayer. The snooty, snarky, snobby, spiritually illiterate, Unscientific Atheist cannot grasp this concept. Matters of the heart are as incomprehensible to him as his mendacious mathematical monstrosities are to the common man. The Unscientific Atheist thus has no other recourse but to childishly ridicule that which he cannot understand; stupidly fixating on the perceived superstitions instead of the underlying substance.

*

So there it is. You *do* have a purpose in this life. You are *not* the worthless result of random cosmic and biological accidents. Logic and deduction *prove* that an intelligent and creative force, far beyond our full understanding, created man and instilled within him the unique ability to fulfill an astonishing "upward reach", not just within our own lives and immediate circles, but also as a collective.

To succeed, the upward reach of humanity must respect the self-evident Laws of Nature and Nature's God, as encoded within our HNS *(Human Navigation System)*. Among these laws are the requirements to do right, to be industrious, to be responsible, to be disciplined, to be loving, to pass on a better world to the next generation, and most of all, when necessary, to mercilessly contain the cancer cells of evil that lie within us, and within society, now and forever.

There is a bible verse that sums up this philosophical concept very well:

"If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and I will forgive their sin and will heal their land." **(5)**

The broken world can easily be healed by humbly seeking *(through reason and logic)* the face *(the deduced will)* of the Intelligent Designer of classical science and rational thought. But before we can even attempt to seek His metaphorical face, we must first remove the dark curtain that is concealing it from view.

And the thick black fabric that is concealing the Divine face is none other than the cunning Darwinian cloak of unscientific Atheistic Evolution.

May “the Force” be with you; as they say in *Star Wars*. May reason and logic be with you. May God be with you!

The End

Read the other illustrated works of M S King available via Amazon and Kindle.

King is also the author of:

- *The Bad War: The Story Never Taught About World War 2*
- *The War Against Putin: What the Government-Media Complex Isn't Telling You About Russia*.
- *The Real Roosevelts: What Ken Burns Didn't Tell You)*


THE BAD WAR
THE TRUTH NEVER TAUGHT ABOUT WORLD WAR 2
M. S. King
THE WAR AGAINST PUTIN
WHAT THE GOVERNMENT-MEDIA COMPLEX ISN'T TELLING YOU ABOUT RUSSIA
M. S. KING
THE REAL ROOSEVELTS
An Omitted History
What PBS & Ken Burns Didn't Tell You
M. S. KING

FOOTNOTES

Chapter 1

1- Internet Search term: “Sherlock holmes when you have eliminated’

Chapter 2

1- Internet Search term: ‘Alfred Russel Wallace’

2- Internet Search term: ‘On the Origin of Species I infer by analogy’

3- Internet Search term: ‘On the Origin of Species as species are produced and exterminated’

4- Internet Search term: ‘Louis Agassiz vs. Darwin’

Chapter 3

1- Internet Search term: ‘Aristotle we ought in fairness to fight our case’

Chapter 4

1- Internet Search term: ‘Buddha do not go by reports by legends’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Sherlock Holmes Sign of Four I never guess’

3- Internet Search term: ‘Sherlock Holmes capital mistake to theorize’

4- Internet Search term: ‘Tesla scientists have substituted’

5- Internet Search term: ‘Tesla Einstein long haired crank’

6- Internet Search term: ‘Tesla Relativity is a massive deception’

7- Internet Search term: ‘Tesla fortunate to make two far-reaching discoveries’

8- Internet Search term: ‘Edison I don’t think anything about it because I don’t understand it.’

9- Internet Search term: ‘Essen students are told that the theory must be accepted

10- Internet Search term: ‘Einstein no amount of experimentation can prove me right’

Chapter 5

1- Internet Search term: ‘Open Letter Big Bang relies growing number of hypothetical entities’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Hawking the beginning of time’

3- Internet Search term: ‘Hawking the beginning of time’

4 - Internet Search term: ‘Hawking the beginning of time’

5- Internet Search term: ‘Hawking decided to answer only theoretical physics questions’

6- Internet Search term: ‘Hawking training in mathematics inadequate for work’

Chapter 6

1- Internet Search term: ‘Lysenkoism’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Stalin bravo comrade Lysenko bravo’

3- Internet Search term: “Harold Urey communist fronts’

Chapter 8

1- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin Origin Species We ought to be extremely cautious in saying’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin Origin Species The real affinities of all organic beings’

3- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin Origin Species I should infer by analogy’

4- Internet Search term: ‘Buddha do not go by reports by legends’

5- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin Origin Species cases of special difficulty on the theory’

6- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin an interminable number of intermediate forms’

7- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin we should remember that we have no right to expect’

8- Internet Search term: Darwin I freely confess absurd in highest degree

9- Internet Search term: ibid

10- Internet Search term: ibid

11- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin doctrine of the extermination of infinitude of connecting links’

12- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin the geological record far more imperfect’

13- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin that the geological record is imperfect all will admit’

14- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin geology plainly declares that all species have changed’

15- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin this Abstract, which I now publish, must necessarily imperfect

16- Internet Search term: ‘Louis Agassiz vs. Darwin’

Chapter 9

1- Internet Search term: ‘Ernst Haeckel fake drawings’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Mount Haeckel Mt Darwin’

Chapter 10

1- Internet Search term: ‘Dating Rocks By Fossils multi-legged sea animals trilobites abundant’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Dating Rocks By Fossils multi-legged sea animals trilobites abundant’

3- Internet Search term: ‘The Piltdown Man Hoax’

4- Internet Search term: ‘Life magazine Jennings Bryan brass medal fourth class’

5- Internet Search term: ‘Stephen Jay Gould brought up by a Marxist father’

6- Internet Search term: ‘Library of congress stephen gould a living legend award’

Chapter 12

1- Internet Search term: New 'Super Rats' Evolve Resistance to Poison

2- Internet Search term: chemical arsenal we have developed attempt to rid our homes of rodents

Chapter 13

1- Time Magazine, October 1, 2006 how we became human

Chapter 14

1- As told to me by Sanjay Patel

2- Internet Search term: ‘Genome news network.org sizing up genomes: Amoeba is king’

3- Internet Search term: ‘Telegraph March 2003 Do genes reveal hand of God discoverers DNA’

4- Internet Search term: ‘Ben carson on rejecting evolution ID future david bose’

Chapter 15

1- Internet Search term: Buddha do not go by reports, by legends

2- Internet Search term: Darwin the real affinities of all organic beings

3- Internet Search term: Darwin this doctrine of the extermination of infinitude connecting links

Chapter 16

1- Internet Search term: ‘Aesop’s fable birds and beasts’

Chapter 17

1- Internet Search term: ‘Friedrich engels first copies darwin’

2- Internet Search term: ‘engels letter Darwin whom I'm just reading now, is absolutely splendid’

3- Internet Search term: ‘marx darwin contains basis on natural history for our view.’

4- Internet Search term: ‘marx letter darwin suits my purpose Ferdinand Lassalle’

5- Internet Search term: ‘marx I am amused at Darwin into whom I looked again’

6- Internet Search term: ‘marx darwin overthrew Malthus theory

7- Internet Search term: ‘Wilhelm liebknecht we spoke of nothing else for months but Darwin’

8- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin’s bulldog Huxley marx attended lectures’

9- Internet Search term: ‘St. Augustine truth is like a lion’

10- Internet Search term: ‘engels das kapital process of transformation demonstrated by Darwin

11- Internet Search term: ‘Charles Darwin on the part of his sincere admirer Karl Marx

12- Internet Search term: ‘Darwin marx we both earnestly desire the extension of knowledge’

13- Internet Search term: ‘Churchill worldwide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization’

14- Internet Search term: ‘Solzhenitsyn Bolshevism committed greatest human slaughter’

15- Internet Search term: ‘Sam adams practice every art to poison morals’

16- Internet Search term: ‘George washington farewell address’

17- Internet Search term: ‘Brandon smith humanity is not only hardwired with a dark side’

Chapter 19

1- Internet Search term: ‘Einstein the bigotry of the non believer is for me’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Kitzmiller vs dover judge breathtaking inanity of Board's decision’

3- Internet Search term: ‘Ben carson emory university address evolution protest’’

4- Internet Search term: ‘MSNBC debate 2008 Do you believe in evolution’

5- Internet Search term: ‘Francis Collins I have led a consortium of scientists to read genome’

6- Internet Search term: ‘Dawkins foundation scientists should not debate creationists’

7- Internet Search term: ‘Daily Beast Nye spent debate sounding like clueless geek’

8- Internet Search term: Anthony Flew Since the beginning of my philosophical life socrates

9- Internet Search term: Anthony Flew growing empathy with the insight of Einstein and other

10- Internet Search term: Anthony Flew I have been denounced by my fellow unbelievers

Chapter 21

1- Internet Search term: ‘Dem bones lyrics’

2- Internet Search term: CNN, December 1, 2014: Earth has its own 'Star Trek'-like Force Field

3- Internet Search term: Hawking laws science values of these numbers very finely adjusted

Chapter 22

1- Internet Search term: ‘2009 Pew research poll scientists believe in god’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Ben franklin father of lights to illuminate our understandings’

3- Internet Search term: ‘john kennedy when Thomas Jefferson dined alone’

4- Internet Search term: ‘Declaration of independence’

5- Internet Search term: ‘Edison I call nature supreme intelligence that rules matter’

6- Internet Search term: ‘Edison entities that are intelligent and directed by this Higher Power’

7- Internet Search term: ‘Einstein you’ll have to ask tesla’

8- Internet Search term: ‘Tesla gift of mental power comes from God divine being’

9- Internet Search term: ‘Von Braun is without doubt the greatest rocket scientist in history’

10- Internet Search term: ‘My Faith Von Braun’

11- Internet Search term: ‘Ben carson I don’t believe in evolution’

12- Internet Search term: ‘Ben carson on rejecting evolution ID future david bose’

13- Internet Search term: ‘Ben carson I don’t believe in evolution’

14- Internet Search term: ‘Ben carson a lot of evolutionists are very ethical people’

15- Internet Search term: ‘Voltaire if God does not exist would be necessary to invent one’

16- Internet Search term: Einstein I believe in Spinoza's God

17- Internet Search term: Einstein In common parlance this may be described as "pantheistic

18- Internet Search term: Einstein but I do not share the crusading spirit of the atheist

19- Internet Search term: Einstein I am fascinated by Spinoza's Pantheism

20- Internet Search term: Einstein In view of such harmony in the cosmos

21- Internet Search term: Einstein fanatical Atheists...are like slaves

22- Internet Search term: Einstein me preferable to the lack of any transcendental outlook

Chapter 23

1- Internet Search term: ‘Harry Kemp the architect’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Tesla onward march’

3- Internet Search term: ‘Putin Many Euro-Atlantic countries have moved away from their roots’

4- Internet Search term: "Jefferson I have sworn eternal hostility against tyranny over the mind’

Chapter 24

1- Internet Search term: ‘Edmond burke all that is necessary for evil’

2- Internet Search term: ‘Bestiality brothels erotic zoos germany’

3- Internet Search term: ‘Solzhenitsyn in prison a human being confronts his grief face to face’

4- Internet Search term: ‘Solzhenitsyn line dividing good and evil cuts through heart of every’

5- Internet Search term: ‘If my people, who are called by my name’

*